

THE CONCEPT OF THE IMAGE  
IN THE GREEK FATHERS  
AND THE  
BYZANTINE ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY

GERHART B. LADNER

Except for the notes, this article is substantially identical with a paper read at the Symposium on Byzantine Iconoclasm held at the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection in April 1951.

THE honor rendered to the image passes to the prototype,” to the model or original: Ἡ τῆς εἰκότος τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει. This is the *locus classicus* of the defenders of the images in the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy, and it is the first of three patristic quotations chosen to introduce this paper. The sentence just cited is taken from St. Basil’s late fourth century anti-Arian treatise *On the Holy Spirit*,<sup>1</sup> where it had served to illustrate the unifying image relation of the Son to the Father in the Divine Trinity, a relation first expressed by St. Paul when he said that Christ was the Image of God.<sup>2</sup>

The second text is from the book *On the Making of Man* by Basil’s younger brother, St. Gregory of Nyssa. It was used by St. John of Damascus in his *First Oration on the Images* written not long after the outbreak of iconoclasm in the Byzantine Empire in the second quarter of the eighth century. “As . . . painters transfer the human forms to their pictures by means of certain colours, applying to their work of imitation (μίμημα) the proper and corresponding tints, so that the archetypal beauty may be transferred exactly to the likeness (ὁμοίωσις), thus it would seem to me that our Maker also, with certain tints as it were, by putting on virtues, paints the image” — that means the divine image in us — “with various colours according to His own beauty.”<sup>3</sup> The words image and likeness may already have made it clear what the point of reference of this metaphor is: verses 26 and 27 of the first chapter of the Book of Genesis: “Let us make man to our image and likeness . . . And God created man to His own image: to the image of God He created him. . .”

The third patristic passage to be quoted is again from St. Basil, from his Twenty-Fourth Homily, directed against Sabellians and Arians. For the sake of briefness, I shall slightly paraphrase the lengthy text.<sup>4</sup> Basil says that “the Son” (i.e., Christ) “is from the Father by generation (γεννητῶς) and expresses in Himself the Father by nature (φυσικῶς); as an image He is absolutely without difference, as generated He preserves the same essence as the Father. . .” Now, if even an “Emperor’s image is the Emperor” — for the image does not cause two emperors to exist — Christ all the more is the supreme Emperor, that is, God. For in the case of an imperial image, it is “wood, wax, colors and the art of the painter” which “make up a corruptible image, an imitation of something corruptible,” in the case of Christ, He as an image is “the splendor of the glory” of God.

This text does not seem to have been utilized during the Byzantine

Iconoclastic Controversy, but the same idea and similar terms also occur in the chapter of the treatise *On the Holy Spirit* which has the famous passage mentioned earlier<sup>5</sup> and was often quoted by the Byzantine iconophiles. The distinction of an image by nature (*φυσικῶς*) or generation (*γεννητῶς*) — as in the Father-Son relationship — from an image as *μίμημα*, as an imitation by art, is noteworthy. For a similar distinction of images *κατὰ μίμησιν* or *κατὰ θέσιν* or *κατὰ τέχνην* (imitative or conventional or art images) from images *κατὰ φύσιν* (natural images) was one of the principal *topoi* of the image doctrines of John Damascene, of the Fathers of the Second Nicaenum, and of Theodore of Studion. In order to trace the origin of this distinction — and it has never been traced — it will, however, be necessary to go back far beyond St. Basil to Aristotle and Plato.

The three texts so far discussed are characteristic of the whole relationship between orthodox Byzantine image doctrine and patristic thought. They deal with images in the proper sense in an accidental manner only, and are primarily concerned with Trinitarian, Christological, and anthropological doctrine. The Fathers of the Second Council of Nicaea and the Byzantine theologians of the eighth and ninth centuries in general cannot, of course, have failed to realize that such patristic texts were not written either to approve or disapprove of the use or veneration of images in the Church. In fact, they also made numerous patristic excerpts of a quite different kind in which the paedagogic-religious value or the miraculous effect of actual images of art was stressed: they referred, for instance, to a text from Gregory of Nyssa (not otherwise surviving?) according to which the saint had said that he had never seen a certain pictorial representation of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac without being moved to tears;<sup>6</sup> or to St. Nile of Ancyra's story of a captive monk who was liberated through the dream appearance and intervention of a saint whom he recognized from having seen his image in the past.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, the orthodox Byzantines used the writings of the Fathers as a storehouse not only of practical and didactic but also of doctrinal and speculative arguments. They must then have assumed that patristic utterances like the ones I have quoted in the beginning expressed a concept of the image favorable to them. Modern critics have either agreed or disagreed with them, but no full effort has, to my knowledge, ever been made to ascertain whether there is not an intrinsic and genetic connection between patristic ideas of what an image is and the image doctrine of the Byzantine iconophiles.<sup>8</sup> Nor has the double root, in Holy Scripture and Platonizing thought, of the patristic image concept itself been exactly investigated. The truth is that the Greek Christian concept of the image was elaborated, not in the sphere of art, but in close



contact with the development of the most fundamental dogmas about God and man. Yet this is only one half of the truth: for the image metaphors which were used in the formulation of Trinitarian and anthropological doctrine presuppose pre-Christian views on the character of an image which were based in part on the naturalism of classical and Hellenistic art and in part on a spiritualization of the naturalistic image concept through Platonism. It is from these two hallowed sources — Christian theology and anthropology on the one hand and Platonistic metaphysics and mysticism on the other — that orthodox Byzantine speculation derived the aura of awesome and blissful sacredness which surrounds its idea of an image. Such origins make it easier to understand the vital role of the doctrine of the Holy Images in Byzantine religiousness, and even the majesty and beauty of Byzantine art itself.

The connection of their doctrine with the principal Christian dogmas must be all the more important to the iconophiles since — though they would not admit it — the attitude of the *early* Fathers had been anything but friendly toward the images of *art*. They had rejected their use by Christians and had held a quite derogatory view of religious imagery.<sup>9</sup> It was only in the age of the great Cappadocians, toward the end of the fourth century, when in religious literature and learning, too, the first phase of the fusion between Christianity and Hellenism was well-nigh completed, that religious imagery was no longer considered as idolatry by the leaders of Christian thought. But it remained for the era of the Iconoclastic Controversy to give a thorough theoretical foundation to the distinction between idols and icons.

Following the lead of my three introductory quotations, I shall now try to describe the principal trends of thought which resulted in the emergence of a doctrine of the image of art in Greek Christianity. This will be done with a view to a genetic explanation of orthodox Byzantine teaching on the images, and with only occasional reference to the doctrine of the iconoclasts.

The first of the relevant ideological developments may be defined as the transfer of the image concept from the sensible to the intellectual realm, a long process traceable in Hellenistic and Early Christian thought from Plato to Philo and St. Paul, and from Plotinus and Proclus to Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite and St. John of Damascus. The Divine Logos Himself becomes the Image of God, and even images of such an image participate in its divine character.

Plato himself, as is well known, used the concept of the image first of all to depreciate the world of sense experience and to distinguish it sharply

from the world of ideas. When he says in the *Phaedrus*,<sup>10</sup> "There are few who going to the images behold in them that which the images express," he implies that the so-called real things are only images of their truly real forms or ideas. Now, art for Plato is an imitation of nature, and if the natural things themselves have only a secondary reality and dignity, it follows that works of art will stand even lower in the scale of true values. And since the artist copies not only things of nature but also things made by man, *mimesis* or imitation by art can be called thrice removed from truth: "The art of imitation is then an inferior who marries an inferior and has inferior offspring." This is Plato's standpoint in the tenth book of the *Republic*.<sup>11</sup>

Now if Plato had stopped here, he would, perhaps, have to be considered the forerunner of the Byzantine iconoclasts rather than of the iconophiles.<sup>12</sup> But it must always be remembered that Platonism has two sides. Even in Plato's own late dialogues one finds a conception of images, both natural and artistic, which is not altogether derogatory. This conception and its post-Platonic development were most important for the patristic foundations of orthodox Byzantine image doctrine which are the main subject of this paper.

In the *Timaeus*, Plato sees the whole natural *kosmos* as the perfect image of an eternal *paradigm*, no longer as a deficient, but as a wonderful, manifestation of the divine;<sup>13</sup> cosmic time itself — the measure of all change and decay — is a moving image of eternity.<sup>14</sup> In the *Laws* and in the *Sophist* standards are set up which define the qualities required to give true value even to artistic or imitative images. "Imitation is not to be judged of by pleasure and opinion . . . for, the equal is not equal or the symmetrical symmetrical because somebody thinks or likes something, but they are to be judged by the standard of truth."<sup>15</sup> Whoever wants to judge an artistic image, pictorial or otherwise, must, therefore, know first what the thing represented is; secondly, how true; and thirdly, how well executed the representation is.<sup>16</sup> Among the artists themselves, those are the best who keep to age-old divinely instituted patterns, as are those of Egyptian art,<sup>17</sup> or to pure mathematical forms and relations;<sup>18</sup> and those are the worst who in their works do not exactly represent the existent symmetries of the original, but change them into proportions which may give a mere illusion of reality and beauty.<sup>19</sup> Thus, through participation in, or imitation of, intellectual and intelligible principles like symmetry, number, and equality, even the images of art can according to Plato be somehow connected with the realm of ideas. For like the rest of the world, true images must be images of something truly real. And yet the intellectual and intelligible, the

ideal spheres, remain for Plato far above all imagery – man can hope to reach the *noeton* only by leaving all images behind.<sup>20</sup>

It is not known with certainty when exactly in later Platonism the status of the term and concept *eikon*, image, was raised to join the company of intelligible essences so that, paradoxically enough, the Platonic ideas could be called incorporeal or invisible images. Some suggestions are made by Willms in his excellent book *EIKON*.<sup>21</sup>

It is Philo, the great Jewish Bible scholar and Platonist of the first century of the Christian era, who made the identification of the most sacred ideas (*ἱερώταται ἰδέαι*) with incorporeal images (*εἰκόνες ἀσώματοι*) an accomplished fact.<sup>22</sup> How was this possible? It was possible for two reasons: first, because in later Platonism the ideas were gradually changing from independent entities into thoughts of God,<sup>23</sup> and thus were no longer quite uppermost in the hierarchical order of beings. Secondly, because such an interpretation of the ideas fitted in with Philo's theology of the Divine Logos who is the supremely rational Word of God, the sum of God's powers and energies including the ideas of all things. The Divine Logos is, therefore, for Philo, a kind of second God, and is quite logically Himself called the image of God, ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

In his work *On the Creation of the World*, Philo explains that the intelligible world of invisible light, the *κόσμος νοητός*, is nothing but the Word of God which is the Divine Image.<sup>24</sup> Elsewhere the Logos is called the eldest or first Image of God.<sup>25</sup> What this means becomes clear when we read in the *Allegories to the Third Book of Genesis* that the Logos is God's Shadow "which He made use of like an instrument and so made the world," and that this Shadow and Image is the archetype of all other things. For just as God is the Pattern of the Image or Shadow, so this Image becomes the Pattern of other beings.<sup>26</sup>

It is clear then that Philo is an important link between Platonic and Christian thought on the image. The image quality of the Logos of God who dwells in the very center of divinity is here the reason for the image quality of the entire *kosmos*.

It is very probable that St. Paul, about a generation younger than Philo, knew his writings, and especially his Image-Logos doctrine, to which he, perhaps, makes a polemical reference in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (15:45 ff.).<sup>27</sup> It would appear, however, that Paul derived his own doctrine of Christ as the Image of God chiefly from his novel development of the Genesis account of the creation of man. For when he speaks of Christ as the Image of God it is in connection with the reformation of fallen *man* to and even beyond the state in which he had been created: like many of the

Fathers after him, the Apostle seems to interpret this condition as an image-likeness, not with the Creator directly, but with *the* Image of God, Christ.<sup>28</sup> However this may be, the doctrine of Christ as the Image of God formulated by St. Paul must, of course, remain a guiding principle of all Christian speculation, not only about the Son of God, but also about images.

It was especially in the Trinitarian controversies of the fourth century concerning the true divinity of Christ that the necessity arose to show that an image can be essentially the same as its original.

Even though by the fourth century much of Graeco-Roman naturalism had been given up in the practice of art, the theoretical conception of the image was still based, to a large extent, on the matter-of-fact naturalism or even illusionism of Plato's time and on the Platonic view that a true image reproduces its model faithfully.<sup>29</sup>

St. Athanasius, the great fighter for Christ's full divinity, was, perhaps, the first to use in this connection the simile of the Emperor's image which we have already met in St. Basil.<sup>30</sup> The Athanasian and Basilian formulations, and several patristic variants, were often quoted by the Byzantine iconodules.

Athanasius argues as follows:<sup>31</sup> "In the image there is the idea (εἶδος) and form (μορφή) of the emperor. . . The Emperor's likeness is unchanged in the image, so that who sees the image, sees the emperor in it, and again who sees the emperor, recognizes him to be the one in the image. . . The image might well say: 'I and the emperor are one,' 'I am in him and he is in me. . .'" — (an obvious parallelism to the Gospel of St. John: "I and the Father are one. . ." and "I am in the Father, and the Father in me.")<sup>32</sup> Athanasius continues: "Who, therefore, adores the image, adores in it also the emperor. For the image is the form of the latter and his idea."

Kindred examples could be multiplied. The underlying idea is always the same: that in so far as an image is similar to the original, it is *equal*, *identical*, with it.

It has often been observed that the image of Christ was the prime concern both of iconoclast and iconophile theory. The relationship between Trinitarian doctrine and the concept of the image as such helps in explaining this fact. Christ as the Image of God was the summit of a great hierarchy of images, expounded by John Damascene in the first and third of his *Orations on the Images*. One is introduced into a world of images which extends from Christ through the divine ideas, through man as image of God, through the symbols and types of Holy Scripture down to the memorials or monuments of literature and art.<sup>33</sup>

This, too, is Platonism, but a Platonism not only Christianized but also

broken through a complex prism of Neoplatonic and Pseudo-Dionysian facets. Through Dionysius the Areopagite, some of the substance of Proclus and Plotinus entered Byzantine image doctrine. In one very important point, however, the image hierarchy of John of Damascus differs from the Neoplatonic system: John no longer calls *the non-human things of nature* images. While for Plato *these latter* had been the images *par excellence*, and for Philo, Plotinus, and Proclus, both intelligible *and* material natures were images, it was in the nature of Christian thought that material natural creatures should stand both above and below the dignity of images: above as creatures of God; below, if compared, for instance, with an image of Christ. For Plato – to use the famous example of the tenth book of the *Republic* – a material bed, as the image of the idea of a bed, is better than any art-image of a bed.<sup>34</sup> For Plotinus, corporeal things are images comparable to the images of art, and both classes of images have reality in so far as they are in contact with the intelligible images of the unimaginable supreme unity, the One.<sup>35</sup> For Proclus, *everything*, except the very highest intelligible and the very lowest material, can exist in its cause (potentially), in itself, and by participation in something higher in the manner of an image.<sup>36</sup> Even Origen was enough of a Platonist to think that not only man but also an animal or a plant may have been created according to some heavenly form or image.<sup>37</sup> But the Areopagite moved farther away from the genuinely Platonic relation between images and ideas. It is true that, at least once, he uses Plato's simile of the sun as the image of the highest Good.<sup>38</sup> Yet on the whole, Pseudo-Dionysius' celestial and ecclesiastical hierarchies are hierarchies of angels and men, of symbols and sacraments. It is typical also for the Dionysian transformation of the Platonistic doctrine of ideas and images that the Areopagite no longer makes use of the terms *idea* or *eidos*. The relational terms *paradigm* and *eikon* from Plato's *Timaeus* do occur,<sup>39</sup> but they are applied in a broader sense which corresponds to St. Paul's teaching that "the invisible things of Him [God] . . . are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made."<sup>40</sup> Truly characteristic for Dionysius and for John of Damascus is the term *proorismos*, a noun related to the Paulinian verb *προορίζω*,<sup>41</sup> which means "to mark out providentially." In the Areopagite<sup>42</sup> and in the Damascene,<sup>43</sup> it signifies God's foreknowledge and pre-definition of the things He was to create. It is then these *proorismoi* which are the ideas existent in the mind of God, and it is they which stand second in the *image* hierarchy of the Damascene, from which the things of a non-human nature themselves are conspicuously *absent*. For the Christian East, not only angels and men but also their symbols and images had gradually come to be incomparably

more important than mere things of nature — and the victory of the orthodox image doctrine in the Iconoclastic Controversy completed this development. Contrary to the Augustinian and, generally speaking, the Western idea of knowing God even through his vestiges in non-human nature,<sup>44</sup> the Byzantines saw the things of nature only as accompanying symbols within a vast cosmic liturgy performed by Christ and by hierarchies of angels and men, and represented by the sacred icons.

In Greek patristic and Byzantine thought, then, the concept of the image refers to *God* Himself and His Incarnation and Revelation and to *man* himself and his inspired prophecy and sacred art. To the influence on Greek patristic and Byzantine image doctrine of the image-likeness of *man* with God, according to the Book of Genesis, I must now return.

The second text introducing this paper, taken from Gregory of Nyssa, compares the creation of man according to God's image and likeness to the painting of a picture. Such comparisons of the divine creation of man with the reproduction of man by art were another commonplace of patristic literature.

The principal scriptural data concerning the creation of man on which the Fathers could and must build contained three problems which demanded interrelated exegetical solutions. First, man was created only to or after the image, whereas Christ was Himself *the* Image of God. Second, according to Genesis 1:26 f., man was made to the image of God, but according to Genesis 2:7, he was molded from earth, and God breathed into him a living soul. Third, he was made not only in God's image but also in God's likeness or similitude (Genesis 1:26). The questions that thus arose all have a bearing on the development of the patristic image concept.

How could corporeal man be made after the image and likeness of an incorporeal God? One type of answer was given by St. Irenaeus of Lyons, at the end of the second century. He countered all anthropomorphic conceptions of God Himself by referring the image relation between God and man in advance, as it were, to God Incarnate, to Christ. For "when the Logos of God became flesh, He truly showed the image . . . Himself becoming that which His image, namely man, already was."<sup>45</sup> Irenaeus was followed in this respect by St. Methodius of Olympus, around 300, who in his dialogue *Symposium* or *On Virginity* said that Christ assumed a human body in order that man could imitate Him better: as if He had painted His picture for us so that we can imitate Him, its painter.<sup>46</sup> Methodius' prime concern was with the full reality of the Incarnation of Christ and the resurrection of all men according to the body or flesh. His metaphors from the

realm of art, therefore, do not emphasize the equality between the representation in the image and the prototype represented, but the indestructible nature of the image's material. Just as a sculptor will melt down a bronze statue if he finds some blemish in it and then cast it anew, so God recreates man in death and resurrection. And just as the metal of the second statue is the same as that of the first, so our body will still be extant in the new life. It will be a spiritual body as St. Paul said, because desiring spiritual things only, but still a body, not some incorporeal substance, as Origen had assumed.<sup>47</sup> Irenaeus is not quoted by the Byzantine iconophiles of the eighth and ninth centuries, and Methodius only once by John of Damascus.<sup>48</sup> But their basic conception that man is an image of Christ *as man* does appear, though less explicitly and exclusively, in later patristic works and may have provided indirectly a fundamental Byzantine argument against iconoclasm: namely, that the image of Christ can and will reproduce Him as man only.

Even more important in itself, and for Byzantine image doctrine, was another approach to the exegesis of the Genesis accounts of the creation of man which is almost the opposite of the first. It is of Alexandrian origin, found in Philo, in Clement, in Origen, and in Athanasius, and it was to become the prevalent patristic interpretation. Here the image relation between God and man is transferred to an altogether different plane, raised to the realm of soul and spirit. We must remember that in patristic as well as in Platonistic thought a bipartite or a tripartite division of the *soul* — according to its reasonable and unreasonable or to its rational, spirited, and desirous-appetitive parts — <sup>49</sup> went along with the dichotomy according to soul and body. It is to his endowment with mind, in other words, to the higher parts of the soul, to reason, to free will, that the image of God in man is referred by most of the Fathers. Already for Philo,<sup>50</sup> man was an image *through his mind* of the Image of God, that is to say, of the Logos, the Divine Word and Reason. That the image-likeness was something spiritual-intellectual was to remain the almost unanimous opinion of the Fathers of the Church from the time of Clement of Alexandria<sup>51</sup> and Origen,<sup>52</sup> that is, from the third century.<sup>53</sup> The only exception I know of is Methodius, whose dependence upon Irenaeus and whose antagonism towards certain doctrines of Origen are also otherwise known.

A further patristic distinction was that between the divine image, *eikon*, and the divine similitude or likeness, *homoiosis*, in man. The image was identified with man's native reasonableness and spiritual freedom, similarity and assimilation to God with his efforts toward perfection, aided by God's grace. The origins of this distinction are found, in somewhat divergent

forms, in the Valentinian Gnosis,<sup>54</sup> in St. Irenaeus,<sup>55</sup> and above all in Clement of Alexandria<sup>56</sup> and Origen.<sup>57</sup>

This whole trend of patristic anthropological exegesis was bound sooner or later to affect the development of the image concept. How could it be otherwise? Man's soul, under its highest intellectual and spiritual aspects, was a painting painted by Christ, the best painter — thus, for instance, Origen in the famous *Thirteenth Homily to Genesis*.<sup>58</sup> The performance of the liturgy, too, could be called a process of spiritual painting or repainting by the hands of Christ, and through the priest who is His pen — thus, for instance, the fifth-century Nestorian Narsai, in his liturgical homilies.<sup>59</sup> Again, according to Origen, the image could be covered through man's fault with wrong colors and become invisible by the accumulation of dirt<sup>60</sup> — this latter a Plotinian metaphor<sup>61</sup> which was taken up also by Athanasius<sup>62</sup> and Gregory of Nyssa.<sup>63</sup> But even so, the image could never be completely destroyed and, therefore, could be restored to its primitive splendor.<sup>64</sup> True, the divine image in man was only a copy made according to *the* Image of God, Christ, an image of the image, but even so it could be a faithful copy, large and skillfully made: "If I shall make the image of the image, that is my soul, great, and shall magnify it by work, thought, and word, then . . . the Lord Himself Whose image it is, will be magnified in our soul" — thus Origen's exegesis of the *Magnificat* in his *Eighth Homily to St. Luke*.<sup>65</sup> The image could, in fact, become as close to its archetype as the image in a cleansed and polished mirror — a favorite metaphor of Gregory of Nyssa<sup>66</sup> in which, as Cherniss has shown, he made use of Plato's *First Alcibiades*<sup>67</sup> and, perhaps, also of Plotinus' mirror similes.<sup>68</sup> Man's soul was finally a sculpture the form of which had to be separated from the rock of brute matter, carved out and smoothed until it conformed to the thought of the supreme artist — thus Gregory of Nyssa,<sup>69</sup> in the tracks of Plotinus' *First Ennead*.<sup>70</sup>

In all these comparisons *similarity* is the term of reference which links the man-God relation to the image-prototype relation. In both cases similarity is almost synonymous with perfection. Just as images can be better or worse, depending on the artist's skill and the subsequent similarity with their originals,<sup>71</sup> so — to quote Gregory of Nyssa — the definition (*ὅρος*) of human happiness is the greatest possible similarity with God.<sup>72</sup> Only of sin, because it is non-being or absence of being, there is no image with which it could be compared — thus Theodoret of Cyrus, or a later glossator, according to a fragment from, or scholion to, his lost *Commentary to Isaiah*.<sup>73</sup>

The whole conception of the image as a blend of like and unlike, same and other, is undoubtedly Platonistic. The remote ancestor of this concep-



tion is found in Plato's own dialogues, for instance at the end of the Sixth Book of the *Republic*,<sup>74</sup> in the *Statesman*,<sup>75</sup> and especially in the *Parmenides*<sup>76</sup> and in the *Sophist*.<sup>77</sup> Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, for example, whose writings John Damascene and Theodore of Studion, of course, knew and who himself had used Proclus' *Commentary on the Parmenides*, if not the *Parmenides* itself,<sup>78</sup> had in fact given an exposition quite Platonic in spirit of the doctrine that God is similar to Himself and to nothing else, and yet gives the greatest possible similarity with Himself to those who turn to Him. "For," the Areopagite says, "things of the same order can have reciprocal similarity . . . but in the case of cause and effect He shall not admit mutual reciprocity."<sup>79</sup> In other words, we must try to become similar to God, but God will never be similar to us. St. Theodore of Studion<sup>80</sup> quotes another Dionysian text from the book *On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, a text which, for the sake of a metaphor, applies this doctrine to the images of art: ". . . in sensible images, if the painter looks without interruption at the archetypal form, neither distracted by any other visible thing nor splitting his attention toward anything else, then he will, so to speak, duplicate the person painted and will show the true in the similitude, the archetype in the image, the one in the other except for their different essences [or natures]."<sup>81</sup>

It is obvious why Byzantine iconophiles quoted this text and many a similar one. They were thus enabled to bolster their ever recurring contention that the image of Christ in a work of art can be identical with Him in one way though not in another: identical as to the form of His humanity and even as to His divine-human hypostasis or person, not identical as to His divine, invisible essence.<sup>82</sup>

Similarity with God, with Christ, as a topic of patristic thought is derived then from a combination of Biblical and Hellenic ideas in which the Christian element, of course, was the dominant. Genesis 1:26-27, Christ's words "Follow me,"<sup>83</sup> St. John's "We shall be like to Him" (*ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα*),<sup>84</sup> blend with phrases from Plato's *Theaetetus* about man's flight from earth to heaven through his becoming similar to God,<sup>85</sup> or from Plotinus' *First Ennead* where the soul's development toward goodness and beauty is called assimilation to God.<sup>86</sup> Clement of Alexandria<sup>87</sup> was probably the first who consciously harmonized the assimilation and followership doctrine of Plato's *Theaetetus* and *Laws*<sup>88</sup> with St. Paul's idea of *μίμησις*. In patristic thought the concept of *mimesis*, imitation, which had been accorded at best a relative dignity by Plato, can stand on the higher level of assimilation to and followership of God, because of St. Paul's designation of himself, and of the Christian in general, as *μιμητὴς Χριστοῦ*.<sup>89</sup> Origen,

for instance, in distinguishing divine image and divine likeness in man, says expressly that similarity to God, lost by original sin, can be regained by imitating and following Him;<sup>90</sup> and Gregory of Nyssa asserts: "Christendom is imitation of the divine nature."<sup>91</sup>

Besides the Biblical and Platonistic tradition, so-called Pythagorean literature, the chronology of which unfortunately is so doubtful, may have influenced patristic ideas about image-likeness, assimilation, and imitation. A few examples will demonstrate the typical uncertainties as to the value of this literature for the knowledge of genuine Pythagorean thought, not to speak of the difficulty of deciding in what relationship some of these documents stand to Hellenic and Jewish-Christian thought, respectively.<sup>92</sup>

Clement of Alexandria in the third century quotes a pseudoepigraphic text, attributed to the Pythagorean Eurysus (meaning Eurytus?).<sup>93</sup> He quotes it as a pagan testimony for man's creation to the image of God. The Neoplatonist Jamblichus (about A.D. 300), in his *Life of Pythagoras*, speaks of followership of, and conformity with, God as of the principal tenet of Pythagorean doctrine.<sup>94</sup> Lucian who in the second century had written that, according to the best of philosophers, man was an image of God,<sup>95</sup> may well have had Pythagoras in mind.<sup>96</sup>

"Pythagorean" influence on the patristic doctrine of *man's* image-likeness with God can in any case hardly have been more than secondary. It has, nevertheless, been mentioned, because this source of patristic thought seems to have been very effective in the case of the ideology of the *ruler* as image of God (see below).

As for the continuity between patristic and Byzantine thought on man's image-likeness with, and imitation of, God, there is ample evidence for it. I mention as an example St. Maximus the Confessor, who carries on the distinction between image and similitude in the manner of Origen.<sup>97</sup> What is, perhaps, the earliest explicit use of the image-likeness doctrine in defense of Christian religious imagery is found in a fragment from the writings of Stephen of Bostra, about whom very little is known otherwise. He seems to have been a seventh- or early eighth-century Bishop of Bostra, that is to say, Bosra in Syria, and wrote a treatise against the Jews which contained anti-iconoclastic passages of considerable interest.<sup>98</sup> It seems that this work was composed at a time when the first distant rumbles of the great Byzantine iconoclastic outbreak of the eighth century could be heard. There is evidence of iconoclastic unrest in various eastern borderlands of the Byzantine Empire from the sixth century onward.<sup>99</sup> To quote one instance, the Younger Symeon the Stylite complained to the Emperor Justin II about the breaking of Christian images by the Samaritans. His letter was read at the Second

Nicaenum.<sup>100</sup> In the seventh century, such trends became more vigorous. It is doubtful whether Moslem influence played a role then. The existence of Jewish and Christian-heretical iconoclasm, however, is certain from historiographical testimony.<sup>101</sup> There also survive Jewish-Christian dialogues of that period, fictitious in their literary form, in which the controversial relation between Christian images and pagan idols is discussed.<sup>102</sup> Stephen of Bostra's work belonged to this genus of writings. We have only extracts from it in two versions: a shorter one in John of Damascus' *Third Image Oration*,<sup>103</sup> and a longer one found in a Codex of the Ambrosiana by Cardinal Mercati, more than half a century ago.<sup>104</sup> The latter is the more faithful, since it is identical with the quotation made by Pope Hadrian I in his letter to the Second Council of Nicaea which was read during the Second Session.<sup>105</sup> In the Ambrosiana excerpt Stephen says: "An image (εἰκών) is one thing, and an idol (ἄγαλμα or ζῶδιον) is another." Then he quotes Genesis 1:26, and continues: "Now is it idolatry and impiety that man is an image of God? Far from it. If Adam were an image of demons, he would be abject and unacceptable; but because he is an image of God, he is honorable and acceptable. . . . And what is the honor rendered to the image if not just honor, as also we sinners do reverence (προσκυνούμεν) one another in accordance with honor and love?"<sup>106</sup> Stephen of Bostra thus establishes a clear distinction between an idol and an image which was to remain a constant and forceful argument of the eighth- and ninth-century defenders of the images. Adoration and salutation of images are not to be construed as idol-worship but as signs of respect and affection. It is interesting to see how in this respect, too, Christian argumentation incorporated certain elements of pagan thought where they seemed to fit.<sup>107</sup> I cannot enter upon the subtle difference between *eikon* and *eidolon* in Platonism.<sup>108</sup> Plotinus and Porphyry certainly wished to avoid the simple identification of the images of gods with the gods themselves.<sup>109</sup> Plotinus used the mirror simile in this connection,<sup>110</sup> and in a fragment from Porphyry's *Peri Agalmaton*, statues of gods are said to have human forms because man alone has an intellectual part (like the godhead itself).<sup>111</sup> Thus the elder Philostratus could claim that whosoever rejects images does an injustice to truth,<sup>112</sup> and Callistratus that in images the divine intelligible is produced by the material.<sup>113</sup> It is also worth while to recall that a late Platonist like Julian the Apostate defended the worshipping of divine images by a comparison with the affectionate or respectful reaction toward the images of emperors or parents,<sup>114</sup> just as some of the Fathers did<sup>115</sup> who were followed among the Byzantine iconodules, for instance, by the Patriarch Nicephorus.<sup>116</sup> Stephen of Bostra's direct parallel between the image-not-idol character of Adam and the image-not-

idol character of religious art, perhaps, may have prompted John of Damascus to insert man as image of God in his hierarchy of images.<sup>117</sup> The same idea, finally, found its most convincing formulation in the *Third Antirrheticus* of St. Theodore of Studion: "The fact that man was made according to the image and likeness of God shows that in the making of an image its form or idea (τὸ εἶδος) is something divine."<sup>118</sup>

The form or idea of the image: this phrase expresses and compresses what were, perhaps, the most original thoughts within Greek Christian image speculation. Above,<sup>119</sup> the fact has been alluded to that for the Fathers and for the Byzantines, identity between image and original does not exist with respect to the former's matter (ὕλη) or the latter's nature (φύσις), which in the case of Christ is even the divine essence (οὐσία). The identity is only a formal, an ideal, a relational one (according to σχέσις or πρὸς τι).<sup>120</sup> There can be no question of putting into a picture made of wood, colors, and the like, the *nature* or *essence* of either man or God. But on the other hand, the iconophiles, and most outspokenly Theodore of Studion, went so far as to hold that Christ's image is identical with Him καθ' ὑπόστασιν.<sup>121</sup> This means that Christ's image was supposed to participate in, or imitate, however relatively, the Second Hypostasis or Person of the Holy Trinity, Christ, not only as man, but as God.<sup>122</sup> This was truly a high claim to make.

Does the influence of Neoplatonic emanationist ideas sufficiently explain such a claim? The truth is simpler and the influence less one-sided. When quoting from St. Basil's *Oration against the Arians and Sabellians* — the third introductory quotation of this paper — I suggested that there existed in the writings of John Damascene and his iconophile successors a distinction of images κατὰ φύσιν or γέννησιν from images κατὰ τέχνην or θέσιν or μίμησιν, which was part of a patristic tradition, itself founded on Platonic and Aristotelian elements. It is this distinction which really overarches all the other ones mentioned. Without it Byzantine image doctrine would be illogical as a system of Christian thought, in which Christ as the natural or essential image of God must be on a higher level than an imitative, a "thetic," that is to say, a "posited" or conventional, image of Christ, an image of art, made by man. In its application to the problems of the Iconoclastic Controversy the *physis-thesis* distinction first appears in John Damascene. It will, therefore, be sufficient to study it briefly in his writings and to trace its origin from there. But it does occur in various forms also in the Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea,<sup>123</sup> in the writings of St. Theodore of Studion,<sup>124</sup> and also in the early ninth-century *Commentary to the Gospel of St. John*,

edited by Hansmann in 1930,<sup>125</sup> which contains numerous references to the problems of religious imagery and to the Iconoclastic Controversy itself.

In his *Third Oration on the Images*, John Damascene defines what an image is, and the first kind of image, he says, is the natural one (*φυσική*). "For in each thing that which is according to nature (*κατὰ φύσιν*) comes first, and only then τὸ κατὰ θέσιν καὶ μίμησιν, that which is according to convention or imitation."<sup>126</sup> Christ, therefore, is the natural Image of the Father, man is God's image by imitation,<sup>127</sup> and so are the images of art. John of Damascus, as everybody knows, was not only a defender of the images but the Byzantine systematizer of patristic thought. His greatest work is *The Fountain of Knowledge*, of which the first part is a *Dialectic*, largely dependent on Aristotelian logic. Chapter 53 in Lequien's edition is entitled *Περὶ τοῦ κείσθαι*.<sup>128</sup> *Κείσθαι*, "situation," is one of Aristotle's categories of thought.<sup>129</sup> The second paragraph of John Damascene's chapter of *Περὶ τοῦ κείσθαι* begins as follows: "Among the things which have a situation (*κειμένων*), some have it κατὰ φύσιν, thus the elements in their proper places, for instance, earth, water, air, fire, etc.; others κατὰ θέσιν καὶ τέχνην, according to their being posited and by art, for instance, a statue, a column, and the like."<sup>130</sup> Now there is as far as I see nothing like this either in Aristotle's *Categories* or in Porphyry's Introduction to it, the famous *Eisagoge*. Yet the relevant terms do occur in Aristotle's *Physics*. In the second book<sup>131</sup> Aristotle speaks of those who see the nature or essence of a thing in its matter, for instance, the wood of a bed, or the bronze of a statue, and not in the normative arrangement and artistic procedure (*τὴν κατὰ νόμον διάθεσιν καὶ τὴν τέχνην*) according to which the bed or statue is made. Also, natural generation is contrasted with technological reproduction. In a later paragraph,<sup>132</sup> Aristotle says that art either completes what nature cannot attain or imitates nature. In these passages one finds all the terms which appear in the *physis-thesis* topos of patristic and Byzantine speculation; it is true that there their use is not strictly in accordance with Aristotle's thought. But this question is not of great concern here, nor the other one, which of the Aristotelian commentators the Damascene may have consulted. Perhaps it was John Philoponus, the Alexandrian Monophysite of the sixth century, of whose theological works John Damascene in his book *On Heresies* gives extracts.<sup>133</sup> Philoponus' *Commentary* on the *Physics* survives,<sup>134</sup> and his terminology does seem to form a link between Aristotle and the Damascene. So, when commenting on the Aristotelian passages just quoted, he uses *θέσις* in addition to the Aristotelian *διάθεσις*,<sup>135</sup> and elsewhere *σχέσις* to paraphrase the Aristotelian *πρὸς ἡμᾶς*:<sup>136</sup> both changes are akin to the use of these terms by John of Damascus. In any case there can hardly be much doubt that the

latter's *physis-thesis* distinction is based on Aristotle or on Aristotelian commentaries and, in addition, perhaps, on Plato's *Cratylus* and Neoplatonic commentaries, such as that of Proclus, where the mutual relation of things and names is treated under the aspects of *physis* and *thesis-mimesis*.<sup>137</sup> Above all, however, John of Damascus rests on earlier patristic tradition in this as in all other points of his doctrine. From this tradition neither the *thesis-physis* nor the *techne-genesis* topos was absent. I mention only a few patristic examples besides the passages from St. Basil already quoted.<sup>138</sup> In one of the surviving fragments from the works of the early fourth-century Bishop Eustathius of Antioch, Christ as man is compared to an art-image made *θέσει*, Christ as God to an image generated *φύσει*.<sup>139</sup> Gregory Nazianzen, in a passage of his *Thirtieth Oration*,<sup>140</sup> says that while it is the nature of an ordinary image to be an imitation (*μίμημα*), Christ as an image of God is much more than that: he is a truer image of the Father even than Seth is of Adam — in Genesis 5:3, Seth is said to be begotten according to the idea and image of Adam — or than anything begotten is of its begetter.<sup>141</sup> This text, in part quoted by John Damascene,<sup>142</sup> seems to be dependent on a similar one in Origen, *De principiis*.<sup>143</sup> Also, the Fifth Ecumenical Council held at Constantinople in 553, in its twelfth anathematism condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia because he allegedly had too closely identified the relationship between an emperor and his image with that between God Father and Christ,<sup>144</sup> at the same time calling Christ Son by adoption, *υιοθεσία*<sup>145</sup> — here, too, we have the contrast between the “thetic” and the natural image.<sup>146</sup> This anathematism is quoted by John Damascene without comment.<sup>147</sup>

The Platonic-Aristotelian-Patristic contrast between *thesis* and *physis*, between imitation by art and natural or supernatural generation, was consciously used as an anti-idolatrous safeguard by the masters of Byzantine image theory. At the same time, owing to the ambivalence of such terms as imitation and assimilation, they found it possible to derive from the very limitation which they imposed upon their own doctrine further support for it. For is imitation of, assimilation to, the divine not the highest duty and privilege, the true grace, of Christendom? Commenting on Exodus 15:11, Origen had said: “Nobody is similar to God, either potentially or by nature . . . only by grace. . .” For, “if an image is said to be similar to its model, this refers to the grace that can be seen in the picture, while the substances of image and model remain quite unlike.”<sup>148</sup> A text from John Chrysostom's *Seventeenth Homily on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, used by John Damascene in a significant paraphrase, shows even more clearly how the images of art could be linked up with the grace of the new dispensation. Hebrews

10:1 reads: "For the Law [that is, the Old Testament], having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things . . ." To this John Chrysostom adds, ". . . not the truth itself. For as long as somebody traces the outlines as in a drawing, there results [only] a sort of shadow; but when he paints over it brilliant tints and lays on colors, then an image emerges."<sup>149</sup> John of Damascus, claiming to quote Chrysostom,<sup>150</sup> writes that Melchisedek was somehow an "image"<sup>151</sup> of Christ, but only in the sense in which somebody might call the painter's adumbration (σκίασμα), that is, the underpainting which precedes the colored picture, the latter's "shadow": in other words, Melchisedek is not a true image (whereas an art image of Christ is). "Therefore the Law is called shadow, but Grace truth, and that which is to come [to come, that is, after the consummation of this world] is called things (πράγματα, i.e., reality). As the Law and Melchisedek are the preliminary adumbration (προσκίασμα) of the colored picture, so Grace and Truth are the colored picture, and so is that which is of the world to come, reality (πράγματα). Thus, the old dispensation is a figure (τύπος) of a figure, and the new a figure of real things."<sup>152</sup> Here, the first theologian of the images has reached the aim of all Byzantine thought on the holy images. He has proved to his own satisfaction and with considerable effect upon following generations that images are *truthful* in so far as truth can be seen at all on this earth. And of Christ who is *the* Truth, there can be images, because of the Incarnation, because His divinity has assumed visible flesh. This coping stone of the edifice of iconophile thought had been anticipated also by the Fathers of the so-called Quinisextum. The famous eighty-second canon of this Constantinopolitan synod demanded that in the future the figure of the Lamb of God, the Saviour, pointed to by John the Baptist, should be replaced in pictures by the image of Christ in His humanity; for Grace and Truth are to be preferred to figures and shadows, to typology and symbolism.<sup>153</sup>

To the obvious question: Did men like John of Damascus or Nicephorus or Theodore of Studion really believe that Christ and the saints had looked just as they appeared in their images? one must reply: They did and they did not. Similarity in the sense of portrait likeness was rather taken for granted than claimed, but allowance was made for the existence of *more or less* similarity, depending on the painters' skill in copying the authentic types. Dobschütz in his valuable book *Christusbilder* has made the most thorough study of the so-called *acheiropoietoi*, images which were thought to have originated without the intermediary of human hands and were supposed to have received true likeness from the impression of the face itself or through other miraculous means. He has shown that the earlier

interest in these acheiropoietic images slackened just at the time of the Iconoclastic Controversy. Eighth- and ninth-century image doctrine attributed comparatively little importance to the *acheiropoietai* and to the claims of miraculous similarity made for them.<sup>154</sup> This fact has received further elucidation through André Grabar's book *Martyrium*. He has made it clear how from the seventh century onward the iconography of the *martyria*, which had been dominated by the memory and evocation of the Holy Places of Palestine and their pictorial decoration, was being replaced in Byzantium by iconographic programs of a different kind; how also, at the same time, icons began to take the place of relics in Byzantine religiousness.<sup>155</sup> It may, perhaps, be said that in the era which just preceded and accompanied the Iconoclastic Controversy, the Byzantine approach to religion and art changed from the historic to the speculative and that, therefore, also the problem of the similarity of the images was treated more in a philosophical than in a practical way. The faithfulness of the great art-types of Christ, the Mother of God, and the saints seemed assured, exactness in copying them was required, and it remained only to caution the faithful that an image was both like and unlike its original, and equal to the prototype only in so far as it *was* like. This John of Damascus, the Fathers of Nicaea, and the other great writers on images did abundantly, using their Platonic-Aristotelian and patristic learning not without skill.

That an image should be similar to its prototype was one point on which Byzantine iconoclasts and iconophiles agreed, though they drew very different conclusions from this demand. There was one other point of agreement between them. Neither the friends nor the enemies of the images in eighth- and ninth-century Byzantium questioned the use of imperial images or their adoration — adoration as *proskynesis timetike* only, of course, and as distinct from *proskynesis latreutike* which was reserved for God alone, even by the iconodules. A study of the patristic antecedents of Byzantine image doctrine — even in the few examples quoted — has shown a close connection between the conception of the imperial image and that of the image of Christ or the saints. From Origen to Theodore of Studion and beyond, examples taken from imperial imagery are over and over again used for the definition of the nature and scope of a religious image.<sup>156</sup> The development of the concept of the religious image cannot be fully understood without reference to the history of ruler worship, and in eastern Christendom even less than anywhere else.

I cannot here attempt to summarize this history, but only draw attention to some of its points of contact with the ideology of image-likeness and



imitation. In the Neo-Pythagorean pseudoepigraphic *Treatises on Kingship* of Ecphantus, Diotogenes, and Sthenidas,<sup>157</sup> the idea of man's image-likeness to God appears in a very significant transformation: not man as such, but the king, is here created after God as his model; it is he who is the imitator of God *par excellence*, while ordinary man is only the image of the royal archetype.<sup>158</sup> It seems that the famous verses of Genesis as well as Hellenic sources were blended into a monarchical ideology, the origins of which can be traced back at least to the orientalized Hellenistic monarchies of the Ptolemies and Seleucids.<sup>159</sup> Norman H. Baynes has made it probable that Eusebius of Caesarea knew these or similar works when he developed his somewhat imperfectly Christian conception of Constantine the Great as God's image, imitator, and vice-regent on earth.<sup>160</sup> The same may hold true for Synesius of Cyrene,<sup>161</sup> at the end of the fourth century, and his pagan contemporary Themistius.<sup>162</sup>

In this respect, too, then, Byzantium, which gradually was to Christianize the Neo-Pythagorean-Eusebian ideology more fully, stands within a long tradition of the Greek-speaking world. But a rather interesting observation can be made. While in the development of patristic and Byzantine Trinitarian and image doctrine the *imperial image* served as an important simile, the concept of *the ruler himself as image* or imitator of God paralleled but did not overlap the ideological field of religious imagery. In other words, the relationship between God and ruler is never made use of in the theory of the religious image. True, a metaphor such as "the ruler as image" does not easily lend itself to further metaphorical use such as would be required in order to compare the emperor (as image of God) with a work of art as image of its prototype. Yet this cannot have been the only reason for not using the emperor-God relationship in such a way, for the simple man-God relationship served as just such a simile.<sup>163</sup> I believe that these facts rather tend to strengthen the growing realization that Byzantine religious life must not be seen as stifled by a supposedly all-pervading Caesaropapism. The deeper layers of doctrine and spirituality — and the holy icons very much belonged to them — were affected by the Emperor's position in the Church only under extraordinary circumstances, such as the rise of a new heresy, and for this iconoclasm itself is the best example. Christ's words, "Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and to God, the things that are God's,"<sup>164</sup> remained a postulate also in eastern Christendom.

Origen, in so many respects the father of Byzantine thought, both orthodox and heterodox, gives a significant allegorical interpretation of this famous Gospel verse which has a definite bearing on the doctrine of the image.<sup>165</sup> He contrasts with one another the image of the emperor on the

tribute coin and the image of God in the soul of man. "When [Christ] said 'Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's' He meant . . . throw off the earthly image so that you can put on the person of the heavenly image<sup>166</sup> and thus render to God the things that are God's." In Origen's exegesis the imperial image as a symbol of this world has become an analogue to man molded from earth according to Genesis 2:7, and the man of the heavenly or divine image<sup>167</sup> is analogous to the image of Christ, which was not on the imperial coin — one might be tempted to add: not yet on the imperial coin. That Christ and the emperor *could* appear on Byzantine coins, first during the reigns of Justinian II (about 700) and then continuously from the end of the Iconoclastic Controversy to the end of the Empire<sup>168</sup> — this was in a sense a fulfillment of Origen's allegory and a realization of patristic image doctrine in general.

## NOTES

1. *De Spiritu Sancto* XVIII, 45, Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* (hereafter PG) XXXII, 149 C: "Ὅτι βασιλεὺς λέγεται καὶ ἡ τοῦ βασιλεὺς εἰκὼν καὶ οὐ δύο βασιλεῖς. Οὐτε γὰρ τὸ κράτος σχίζεται οὔτε ἡ δόξα διαμερίζεται. Ὡς γὰρ ἡ κρατοῦσα ἡμῶν ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία μία, οὕτω καὶ ἡ παρ' ἡμῶν δοξολογία μία καὶ οὐ πολλαί. διότι ἡ τῆς εἰκόνος τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει.

2. Cf. 2 Corinthians 4:3; Colossians 1:15; etc.

3. Gregory of Nyssa, *De officio hominis*, 5 PG XLIV, 137 A: "Ὡς περ τοίνυν τὰς ἀνθρωπίνους μορφὰς διὰ χρωμάτων τινῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς πινάκας οἱ γραφεῖς μεταφέρουσι τὰς οἰκείας τε καὶ καταλλήλους βαφὰς ἐπαλείφοντες τῷ μιμήματι ὡς ἂν δι' ἀκριβείας τὸ ἀρχέτυπον κάλλος μετενεχθείη πρὸς τὸ ὁμοίωμα, οὕτω μοι νόει καὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον πλάστην οἶον τισὶ βαφαῖς τῇ τῶν ἀρετῶν ἐπιβολῇ πρὸς τὸ ἴδιον κάλλος τὴν εἰκόνα περιανθίσαντα. . . In part quoted by John Damascene, *De imaginibus, oratio I*, PG XCIV, 1269 A f. The text from St. Basil quoted in notes 1 and 5 is also found in John Damascene, *ibid.*, 1261 D f.

4. *Homil. XXIV, Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos*, PG XXXI, 607 A f.: Διότι γεννητῶς ὑπάρχων ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱὸς καὶ φυσικῶς ἐκτυπῶν ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν Πατέρα, ὡς μὲν εἰκὼν τὸ ἀπαράλλακτον ἔχει, ὡς δὲ γέννημα τὸ ὁμοούσιον διασώζει. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ κατὰ τὴν ἀγορὰν τῇ βασιλικῇ εἰκόνι ἐνατενίζων καὶ βασιλέα λέγων τὸν ἐν τῷ πινάκι δύο βασιλεῖς ὁμολογεῖ, τὴν τε εἰκόνα καὶ τὸν οὐ ἔστιν ἡ εἰκὼν. . . Εἰ γὰρ ἡ εἰκὼν βασιλεὺς, πολλῶς δήπου εἰκὸς βασιλέα εἶναι τὸν τῇ εἰκόνι παρασχομένον τὴν αἰτίαν. Ἄλλ' ἐνταῦθα μὲν ξύλα καὶ κηρὸς καὶ ζωγράφου τέχνη τὴν εἰκόνα ποιεῖ φθαρτὴν φθαρτοῦ μίμημα καὶ τεχνητὴν τοῦ ποιηθέντος· ἐκεῖ δὲ ὅταν ἀκούσης εἰκόνα, ἀπαύγασμα νόει τῆς δόξης.

5. That passage continues as follows (PG XXXII, 149 C): 'Ὁ οὖν ἔστιν ἐνταῦθα μιμητικῶς ἡ εἰκὼν, τοῦτο ἐκεῖ φυσικῶς ὁ Υἱὸς. Καὶ ὥς περ ἐπὶ τῶν τεχνικῶν κατὰ τὴν μορφήν ἡ ὁμοίωσις, οὕτως ἐπὶ τῆς θείας καὶ ἀσυνθέτου ἐν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς θεότητός ἐστιν ἡ ἔνωσις.

6. Cf. John Damascene, *De imaginibus, oratio I*, PG XCIV, 1269 C, *oratio III, ibid.* 1361 C f.; the same text is cited in the *Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea*, Mansi, *Concil. XIII*, 9 C, XII, 1066 B.

7. *Epist. IV*, 62, *Heliodoro Silentario*, PG LXXIX, 580 f., also in the *Acts of the Second Nicaenum*, Mansi, *Concil. XIII*, 31 C ff.

8. The best study of patristic and early Byzantine concepts of the image is contained in the book of K. M. Setton, *Christian Attitude towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century* . . . (New York, 1941), especially 198 ff. Setton's material is in part identical with that used in this article, but the scope of the two studies is, of course, different. A fair number of patristic sources of the Byzantine iconophiles is arranged in convenient lists by E. J.

Martin, *A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy* (London, s.a.) 146 ff., 197 f. Cf. also V. Grumel, in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* VII/1 (Paris, 1927) 766 ff., s.v. *Images* (*Culte des*).

9. Cf. Hugo Koch, *Die altchristliche Bilderfrage nach den literarischen Quellen* (*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* XXVII, 1917); W. Elliger, *Die Stellung der alten Christen zu den Bildern in den ersten vier Jahrhunderten* (*Studien über christliche Denkmäler* XX, 1930); *id.*, *Zur Entstehung und frühen Entwicklung der altchristlichen Bildkunst* (*ibid.* XXIII, 1934).

10. *Phaedrus* 250 B.

11. *Republic* 597 E; 603 B.

12. In a very interesting article, "Origen, Eusebius and the Iconoclastic Controversy," *Church History* XIX (1950) 77 ff., Father George Florovsky, while not denying Platonistic elements in Byzantine iconophile doctrine, stresses the undeniable anti-iconic spiritualistic element in Platonism and Origenism as the main source of iconoclastic theology as well.

13. *Timaeus* 29 B.

14. *Ibid.* 37 C.

15. *Laws* 667 E f.

16. *Ibid.* 669 A-B.

17. *Ibid.* 656 D.

18. Cf. *Philebus* 51 C.

19. *Sophist* 235 D-236 A.

20. For a similar interpretation of Plato's attitude toward art, see, for instance, P.-M. Schuhl, *Platon et l'art de son temps* (*Arts plastiques*) (Paris, 1933).

21. H. Willms, *EIKON* (Münster, 1935).

22. See also H. A. Wolfson, *Philo* I (Cambridge, Mass., 1948) 238 f.

23. For the history of this change, and for its relation to the late-Platonistic tendency toward explaining the work of art by its idea in the artist's mind, cf. E. Panofsky, "Idea," (*Studien der Bibliothek Warburg* V, Leipzig, Berlin, 1924) 5 ff., 8 ff.; also W. Theiler, *Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus* (Berlin, 1930) 15 ff.; E. Birmelin, "Die kunsttheoretischen Gedanken in Philostrats Apollonios," *Philologus* LXXXVIII (1933) 402 ff.; Willms, *op. cit.*, 26 f.; F. Cayré, *Initiation à la philosophie de Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1947) 199 ff. F. Steckerl, "On the Problem: Antefact and Idea," *Classical Philology* XXXVII (1942) 288 ff.

24. *De opificio mundi* 24 f., 31. *Philonis Alexandrini Opera* . . . edd. L. Cohn and P. Wendland (Berlin, 1896 ff.) I, 7 f., 9.

25. *De confusione linguarum* 147 f., *loc. cit.* II, 247.

26. *Legum Allegor.* III, 96, *loc. cit.* I, 134.

27. See especially 1 Corinthians 15:49: "Therefore, as we have borne the image of the earthly, let us bear also the image of the heavenly." Did St. Paul, in insisting that the heavenly and spiritual comes *after* the earthly and physical (1 Corinthians 15:46 f.), also mean to reject Philo's preëxistent "ideal" man who was not clearly distinct from the Divine Logos, but explicit in the "generic" heavenly man (who together with the "generic" earthly man makes up the historical Adam)? The question is controversial. See B. A. Stegmann, O.S.B., *Christ, the "Man from Heaven"* (Washington, D.C., 1927); for Philo's conception of "genus" and "generic," also Wolfson, *Philo* I, 251 f.; furthermore, E.-B. Allo, *Saint Paul: Première Épître aux Corinthiens* (Paris, 1935) 426 ff.

28. Cf. above all Colossians 3:9 f. For the doctrine of Christ as the Image of God and of man as created and reformed after the image of God, see the following recent works: R. Leys, *L'image de Dieu chez Saint Grégoire de Nysse* (Bruxelles, Paris, 1951), with references to similar studies on Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Athanasius; W. Dürig, *Imago: Ein Beitrag zur Terminologie und Theologie der Römischen Liturgie* (München, 1952); D. Cairns, *The Image of God in Man* (New York, 1953); also G. Ladner, "Die mittelalterliche Reformidee und ihr Verhältnis zur Idee der Renaissance," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreich. Geschichtsforschung* LX (1952) 31 ff.

29. Cf., for instance, Proclus, *In Timaeum* II, 81 B f. (to *Timaeus* 28 A f.), quoted by Panofsky, "Idea," note 63. For "Verismus" in the Graeco-Roman conception of the image,

see the excellent pages in K. Borinski, *Die Antike in Poetik und Kunsttheorie*, I (Leipzig, 1914) 1–21.

30. Professor A. M. Friend, Jr., draws my attention to the fact that according to Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Cod. 119, PG CIII, 400 B f., Pierius, late third-century head of the Catechetical School of Alexandria, had made some statement about the relation between image and prototype which Photius interpreted in the sense of Basil's famous sentence; see also O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* II<sup>2</sup> (Freiburg i. B., 1914) 236. But it may well be that Pierius following Origen — cf. *Contra Celsum* VII, 66, *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, ed. Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften (hereafter quoted GCS), Origenes, II, 216, and VIII, 17 f., *ibid.* 235 f. — was speaking not of Christ as the Image of God but of man as made according to God's image and likeness.

31. *Oratio III contra Arianos* 5, PG XXVI, 332 A f.: 'Εν γὰρ τῇ εἰκόνι τὸ εἶδος καὶ ἡ μορφή τοῦ βασιλέως ἐστὶ καὶ ἐν τῷ βασιλεῖ δὲ τὸ ἐν τῇ εἰκόνι εἶδος ἐστίν. Ἀπαράλλακτος γὰρ ἐστίν ἡ ἐν τῇ εἰκόνι τοῦ βασιλέως ὁμοιότης· ὥστε τὸν ἐνορῶντα τῇ εἰκόνι ὁρᾶν ἐν αὐτῇ τὸν βασιλέα καὶ τὸν πάλιν ὁρῶντα τὸν βασιλέα ἐπιγιγνώσκειν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐν τῇ εἰκόνι. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ μὴ διαλλάττειν τὴν ὁμοιότητα τῷ θέλοντι μετὰ τὴν εἰκόνα θεωρῆσαν τὸν βασιλέα εἴποι ἂν ἡ εἰκὼν· Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν ἐσμεν. Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐν ἐκείνῳ εἰμὶ, κακείνος ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ ὁ ὁρᾶς ἐν ἐμοί, τοῦτο ἐν ἐκείνῳ βλέπεις, καὶ ὁ ἐώρακας ἐν ἐκείνῳ, τοῦτο βλέπεις ἐν ἐμοί. Ὁ γοῦν προσκυνῶν τὴν εἰκόνα ἐν αὐτῇ προσκυνεῖ καὶ τὸν βασιλέα· ἡ γὰρ ἐκείνου μορφή καὶ τὸ εἶδος ἐστίν ἡ εἰκὼν. This text is quoted with some slight variations, for instance, by John Damascene, *De imaginibus, oratio III*, PG XCIV, 1405 A, and in the *Acts of the Second Nicaenum*, Mansi, *Concil.* XIII, 69 B f.

32. John 10:30; 14:10.

33. John Damascene, *De imaginibus, oratio I*, 9 ff., PG XCIV, 1240 C ff.; *De imaginibus, oratio III*, 18 ff., *ibid.*, 1337 C ff.

34. *Republic* 597.

35. *Ennead* V, 9, 5; cf. V, 2, 1, V, 3, 7, V, 9, 11.

36. *The Elements of Theology*, Proposition 65, ed. E. R. Dodds (Oxford, 1933) 62 f., and Commentary 235 f. (see also the other Propositions referred to there).

37. *In Canticum Canticorum* II, 9, GCS, Origenes, VIII, 209: it may be that plants and animals "habeant . . . incorporalium rerum formas et imagines quibus doceri anima possit et instrui ad contemplanda etiam ea quae sunt invisibilia et caelestia . . ."

38. *De divinis nominibus* IV, 4, PG III, 697 B f.

39. *Op. cit.* V, 8, *ibid.* 824 C; *De coelesti hierarchia* 1, 3, *ibid.* 121 D; *Epist.* 10, *ad Johannem, ibid.* 1117 A f.

40. Romans 1:20.

41. Cf. Romans 8:29; 1 Corinthians 2:7; Ephesians 1:5; 1:11.

42. *De divinis nominibus* V, 8, PG III, 824 C.

43. Cf. *De imaginibus, oratio I*, 10, PG XCIV, 1240 D; *oratio III*, 19, *ibid.* 1340 C.

44. For St. Augustine, see E. Gilson, *Introduction à l'étude de Saint Augustin*<sup>2</sup> (Paris, 1949) 275 ff. A secularized version of this conception can still be found in Shakespeare's famous verses in *As You Like It*, II, 1:

" . . . tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,  
Sermons in stones, and good in every thing."

45. *Adversus Haereses* V, 16, 1, ed. W. W. Harvey, II (Cambridge, 1857) 368: As long as the Word according to the image of which man had been made was invisible, man lost the similitude easily. Ὅποτε δὲ σάρξ ἐγένετο ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὰ ἀμφοτέρω ἐπεκύρωσε: καὶ γὰρ καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα ἐδείξεν ἀληθῶς αὐτὸς τοῦτο γενόμενος ὅπερ ἡ εἰκὼν αὐτοῦ· καὶ τὴν ὁμοίωσιν βεβαίως κατέστησε συνεξομοιώσας τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῷ ἀοράτῳ πατρὶ . . .

46. *Symposium* I, 4 (24), GCS, Methodius 13: Ταύτη γὰρ ἡρετίσατο τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἐνδύσασθαι σάρκα θεὸς ὢν ὅπως ὥσπερ ἐν πίνακι θεῖον ἐκτύπομα βίου βλέποντες ἔχουμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς τὸν γράψαντα μιμῆσθαι. For the painter simile, see below, p. 12.

47. For all this, see Methodius, *De resurrectione* I, 35, 3–4 f.; 43, 2 ff.; II, 10, 7–12, 10; III, 6; 16, 9; *loc. cit.* 274 f.; 289 ff.; 352 ff.; 396 ff.; 413. See also N. Bonwetsch, "Die Theologie des Methodius von Olympos" *Abhandlungen der kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissen-*

schaften zu Göttingen, *Philologisch-historische Klasse, Neue Folge*, VII/1 (Berlin, 1903) 119, 123.

48. John Damascene, *De imaginibus, oratio III*, PG XCIV, 1420 B, quotes Methodius, *De resurrectione II*, 24 (GCS, *Methodius* 379 f.). Identical quotation in the *Sacra Parallela*, ed. K. Holl, *Fragmente vornicänischer Kirchenväter aus den Sacra Parallela (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, Neue Folge*, V/2, Leipzig, 1899) 183, no. 430.

49. Cf., for instance, H. F. Cherniss, *The Platonism of Gregory of Nyssa* (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, XI, Berkeley, 1934) 16 ff.

50. *De opificio mundi I*, 69, ed. Cohn and Wendland, *loc. cit.*, I, 23.

51. *Stromata V*, 14 (94, 5), GCS, *Clemens Alex.*, II, 388: Εἰκὼν μὲν γὰρ θεοῦ λόγος θεῖος καὶ βασιλικὸς ἄνθρωπος ἀπαθής, εἰκὼν δ' εἰκόνας ἀνθρώπινος νοῦς. See also *Stromata II*, 19 (102, 6), *ibid.* 169: Τῷ γὰρ <<κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν>> . . . οὐ τὸ κατὰ σῶμα μὴνύεται . . . ἀλλ' ἡ κατὰ νοῦν καὶ λογισμὸν . . .

52. *De principiis IV*, 4, 10, GCS, *Origenes*, V, 363; *In Genesim homil. I*, 13, *ibid.* VI, 15: "Hunc sane hominem quem dicit 'ad imaginem Dei' factum, non intelligimus corporalem. Non enim corporis figmentum Dei imaginem continet . . . Is . . . qui 'ad imaginem Dei' factus est, interior homo noster est, invisibilis et incorporealis et incorruptus atque immortalis." Cf. *Contra Celsum VI*, 63, *ibid.*, II, 133; VII, 66, *ibid.* 216; *Selectiones in Genesim*, PG XII, 93 ff.; *In Canticum Canticorum*, Prologue, GCS, *Origenes*, VIII, 64.

53. See also Athanasius, *Oratio II contra Arianos* 78, PG XXVI, 312 B f. Man's dominion over the earth under God, his upright posture and royal quality, often referred to by the Fathers, hardly imply a corporeal conception of the image-likeness with God (*pace Cairns, op. cit.* above n. 28); see also below, note 163.

54. Cf. A. Strucker, *Die Gottebenbildlichkeit des Menschen in der christlichen Literatur der ersten zwei Jahrhunderte* (Münster, 1913) 55 ff.

55. *Adversus Haereses V*, 6, 1, ed. Harvey, II 334 f.

56. *Stromata II*, 22 (131, 6), GCS, *Clemens Alex.*, II, 185.

57. *De principiis III*, 6, 1, GCS, *Origenes*, V, 280 f.; cf. *Commentar. in Joann.* XX, 22 (20), GCS, *Origenes*, IV, 355, lines 13 ff.

58. *In Genes. homil. XIII*, 4, GCS, *Origenes*, VI, 119: "Filius Dei est pictor huius imaginis [i.e., of the image of *Genesis* 1:26]. Et quia talis et tantus est pictor, imago eius obscurari per incuriam potest, deleri per malitiam non potest." Whether or not the idea is original with Origen (cf. *Acta Joannis* [saec. 2 ex.] 28 f., edd. R. A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha II*, I [Leipzig, 1888] 166 f.), it is certainly part of an old tradition concerning God as artist (see Excursus XXI, "Gott als Bildner," in E. R. Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und Lateinisches Mittelalter* [Bern, 1948] 529 ff.), which goes back at least to the demiurge of Plato's *Timaeus* (cf. also Origen's contemporary, the elder Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, II, 22, about God as painter), and which could blend with the conception of a divine effigy in the virtuous soul (for Origen, see note 71). Such ideas could be turned in an anti-iconic sense, so, for instance, by Eusebius in his famous letter to Constantia in which he blamed her for desiring an art image of Christ (the letter is quoted reprovingly in the *Acts of the Second Nicaenum*, Mansi, *Concil.* XIII, 314; see also PG XX, 1545 ff.); cf. Florovsky, *op. cit.*, 85. Yet, at least from the later fourth century onward, the idea that the virtuous soul is the best image of Christ, the best painter, did not exclude the toleration and even positive evaluation of the Christian image of art by the majority of the theologians.

59. *Homil. XII (B)*, ed. Dom R. H. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai (Texts and Studies*, VIII/1, Cambridge, 1909) 33; *Homil. XXI (C)*, *ibid.* 47, 55. I owe the knowledge of these interesting passages to Professor Ernst Kantorowicz; for further examples, see now his article quoted in note 138.

60. *In Genes. homil. XIII*, 4, *loc. cit.* 119 f.: "Haec [i.e., the image of God] in te videri non poterat, donec domus tua sordida erat immunditiis et rudibus repleta. . . . Cum . . . te libido fuscaverit, induxisti unum colorem terrenum; si vero et avaritia aestuas, miscuisti et alium;" etc.

61. *Enneads I*, 6, 5: . . . οἶον εἴ τις δὺς εἰς πηλὸν ἢ βόρβορον τὸ μὲν ὅπερ εἶχε κάλλος

μηκέτι προφαίνοι, τοῦτο δὲ ὁρῶτο ὁ παρὰ τοῦ πηλοῦ ἢ βορβόρου ἀπεμάζατο. See note 63 for the very close parallelism between this text and a passage from Gregory of Nyssa, who must no doubt have used the Plotinian text. See also J. Daniélou, S.J., *Platonisme et théologie mystique: Essai sur la doctrine de Saint Grégoire de Nysse* (Paris, 1944) 224 ff.

62. *De incarnatione* 14, PG XXV, 120: 'Ὡς γὰρ τῆς γραψείσης ἐν ξύλῳ μορφῆς παραφανισθείσης ἐν τῶν ἔξωθεν ῥύπων πάλιν χρεῖα τοῦτον παραγενέσθαι οὐ καὶ ἔστιν ἡ μαρφή ἵνα ἀνακαινισθῇ ἡ εἰκὼν δυνηθῇ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ὕλῃ — διὰ γὰρ τὴν ἐκείνου γραφήν ἡ αὐτὴ καὶ ὕλη ἐν ἧ καὶ γέγραπται οὐκ ἐκβάλλεται, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῇ ἀνατυπῶνται — κατὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ πανάγιος τοῦ Πατρὸς Υἱὸς εἰκὼν ὢν τοῦ Πατρὸς παρεγένετο ἐπὶ τοὺς ἡμετέρους τόπους ἵνα τὸν κατ' αὐτὸν πεποιημένον ἄνθρωπον ἀνακαινίσῃ . . .

63. *De virginitate* 12, PG XLVI, 372 B: . . . through sin τὸ θεοειδὲς ἐκείνο τῆς ψυχῆς καλλὸς τὸ κατὰ μίμησιν τοῦ προτοτύπου γενόμενον, οἷον τις σίδηρος κατεμελάνθη τῷ τῆς κακίας ἰφ. . . οἷον πάσχουσιν οἱ ἐξ ὀλισθήματος ἐγκατενεγθέντες, βορβόρῳ καὶ τῷ πηλῷ τὴν μορφήν ἐαυτῶν ἐξαλείψαντες ἀνεπίγνωστοι καὶ τοῖς συνήθεσι γίνονται, οὕτως κακείνος ἐμπεσὼν τῷ βορβόρῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀπώλεσε μὲν τὸ εἰκὼν εἶναι τοῦ ἀφθάρτου Θεοῦ. Cf. also *De beatitudinibus*, *Oratio VI*, *ibid.* XLIV, 1272 A f.

64. Cf. Origen, *In Genes. homil.* XIII, 4, *loc. cit.*: "Manet enim semper imago Dei, licet tu ipse superducas 'imaginem terreni' (1 Corinthians 15:49) . . . Et cum deleverit [i.e., God] omnes istos in te colores qui ex fucis malitiae sumpti sunt, tunc resplendet in te imago illa, quae a Deo creata est." See also Gregory of Nyssa, *loc. cit.* 373 A: The lost and sought-for drachma of Luke 15:9 means the image of God the King, τὴν οὐχὶ παντελῶς ἀπολλυμένην ἀλλὰ ὑποκεκρυμένην τῇ κόπρῳ.

65. *In Lucam homil.* VIII, GCS, *Origenes*, IX, 56: "Si considerem Dominum Salvatorem 'imaginem esse invisibilis Dei' (Colossians 1:15), et videam animam meam factam 'ad imaginem conditoris' ut imago esset imaginis — neque enim anima mea specialiter imago est Dei, sed ad similitudinem imaginis prioris effecta est — tunc videbo quoniam in exemplum eorum qui solent imagines fingere et uno, verbi causa, vultu regis accepto ad principalem similitudinem exprimendam artis industriam commodare, unusquisque nostram ad imaginem Christi formans animam suam aut maiorem aut minorem possit imaginem vel obsoletam vel sordidam aut claram atque lucentem et respondentem ad effigiem imaginis principalis. Quando igitur grandem fecero imaginem imaginis, id est animam meam, et magnificavero illam opere cogitatione sermone, tunc imago Dei grandis efficitur et ipse Dominus, cuius imago est, in nostra anima magnificatur." The Greek surviving fragments cover only part of this text as translated by St. Jerome; they do not essentially differ from it.

66. See *De beatitudinibus*, *oratio VI*, PG XLIV, 1272 B; *In Cantic. Cantic.*, *homil.* XV, *ibid.* 1093 D: Καὶ οἷον ἐπὶ τοῦ κατόπτρου γίνεται, ὅταν τεχνικῶς τε καὶ καταλλήλως τῇ χρείᾳ κατασκευασμένον ἦ, ἐν καθαρᾷ τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ δι' ἀκριβείας ἐν ἑαυτῷ δείξει τοῦ ἐπιφανέντος προσώπου τὸν χαρακτήρα, οὕτως ἑαυτὴν ἡ ψυχὴ προσφόρως τῇ χρείᾳ κατασκευάσασα καὶ πᾶσαν ὕλην ἀποβρύψαμένη κήλιδα καταρὼν τοῦ ἀκηράτου κάλλους ἐν ἑαυτῇ τὸ εἶδος ἀνετυπώσατο. See also *In Cantic. Cantic.*, *homil.* III, *ibid.* 824 C; *homil.* IV, *ibid.* 833 B f.; *homil.* V, *ibid.* 868 C f.; *De mortuis*, *ibid.* XLVI, 509 C f.; *De vita Mosis*, *ibid.* XLIV, 340 A; *De hominis opificio* 12, *ibid.* 161 C; *De virginitate* 11, *ibid.* LXIV, 368 C f. Cf. Daniélou, *op. cit.*, 223 ff.

67. 132 f. Cf. Cherniss, *op. cit.*, 40.

68. See *Ennead*, IV, 3, 11; 5, 7; VI, 2, 22; cf. *Ennead* I, 6, 9.

69. *De opificio hominis* 30, PG XLIV, 253 C: Οἷον δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν λιθογλύφων ἔστιν ἰδεῖν. Πρόκειται μὲν γὰρ τῷ τεχνίτῃ ζῶον τινοῦ εἶδος ἐν λίθῳ δείξαι· τοῦτο δὲ προθέμενος πρῶτον μὲν τὸν λίθον τῆς συμφυοῦς ὕλης ἀπεβρῆξεν· εἶτα περικώψας αὐτοῦ τὰ περιττὰ πρόηγαγέ πως διὰ τοῦ πρώτου σχήματος τῇ μμῇσει τῇ κατὰ πρόθεσιν . . . πάλιν ἐπεγρασάμενος προσήγγισε πλέον τῇ ὁμοιότητι τοῦ σπουδαζομένου. Εἶτα τὸ τέλειον καὶ ἀκριβὲς εἶδος ἐγχειρουρήσας τῇ ὕλῃ εἰς πέρας τὴν τέχνην προήγαγε . . . See also the much longer exposition of the same thought in *In Psalmos*, c. 11, *ibid.* 541 D–544.

70. The dependence of Gregory on Plotinus has been clearly established by Daniélou, *op. cit.*, 46. Cf. *Ennead* I, 6, 9: Πῶς ἂν οὖν ἰδοῖς ψυχὴν ἀγαθὴν οἷον τὸ κάλλος ἔχει; Ἄναγε ἐπὶ σαντὸν καὶ ἰδὲ κὰν μήπω σαντὸν ἰδῆς καλὸν, οἷα ποιητὴς ἀγάλματος, ὁ δεῖ καλὸν γενέσθαι, τὸ μὲν ἀφαιρεῖ, τὸ δὲ ἀπέξεσε. τὸ δὲ λείον, τὸ δὲ καθαρὸν ἐποίησεν, ἕως ἔδειξε καλὸν ἐπὶ τῷ ἀγάλати

πρόσωπον, οὕτω καὶ σὺ ἀφαίρει ὅσα περιττὰ καὶ ἀπεύθυνε ὅσα σκολιά, ὅσα σκοτεινὰ καθαίρων, ἐργάζου εἶναι λαμπρὰ καὶ μὴ παύσῃ τεκταίνων τὸ σὸν ἄγαλμα, ἕως ἂν ἐκλάμψῃ σοὶ τῆς ἀρέτης ἡ θεοειδὴς ἀγλαία . . . For this text, see also Panofsky, "Idea," 14 f. Plotinus' concept of *aphairesis* is found in somewhat different expression (ἐξαιρεθέντων, περιαιρέσει) in Gregory of Nyssa, *In Psalmos* c. 11, *loc. cit.* 544 A f. K. Borinski, *Die Antike in Poetik und Kunsttheorie I* (Leipzig, 1914) 169 f., has noted that the Pseudo-Dionysian antithesis of *thesis* and *aphairesis*, used to circumscribe the nature of God who is above "positive" and "negative," above kataphatic and apophatic theology, is still based on the Plotinian artist metaphor (cf. *Theologia Mystica*, 2, PG III, 1025 B, also the scholia to *De divinis nominibus* II, 4 [*ibid.* 641 A; the scholia *ibid.* IV, 217 B–C], attributed to Maximus the Confessor but probably originating from John of Scythopolis; cf. H. U. v. Balthasar, S.J., "Das Scholienwerk des Johannes von Scythopolis," *Scholastik* XV [1940] 16 ff.). There is only a very slight logical and historical connection between the antithesis of *thesis* and *aphairesis* and that of *physis* and *thesis*, discussed below.

71. Origenes, *Contra Celsum* VIII, 17, GCS, *Origenes*, II, 235: "Ὡς περ δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγαλματοποιῶν οἱ μὲν τινες εἰς θανμαστῶς κατορθοῦντες τὸ ἔργον, ὥς περ εἰπὲν Φειδίας ἢ Πολύκλειτος ἢ ζωγράφοι Ζεῦς καὶ Ἀπελλῆς, ἕτεροι δὲ ἑλαττον τούτων ἀγαλματοποιῶσι . . . καὶ ἀπαξάπλως πολλὴ διαφορά ἐστὶ τῆς σῶν ἀγαλμάτων καὶ εἰκόνων κατασκευῆς, thus do some men build up a better image of God in their souls than others — but in no case can even Phidias' Olympic Zeus be compared to man, made according to the image of his creator, not to speak of the image of the Father in our Saviour.

72. *In Psalmos* c. 1, PG XLIV, 433 C: . . . ὁρὸς ἐστὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης μακαριότητος ἡ πρὸς τὸ Θεῖον ὁμοίωσις. Cf. also *De opificio hominis* 5, *ibid.* 137 A f.; *Oratio catechetica* 21, *ibid.* XLV, 57 D; *De professione christiana*, *ibid.* XLVI, 244 Cf.

73. *In Isaiam* 64, 6, PG LXXXI, 481 B: . . . οὐκ ἔχει γὰρ εἰκόνα παραβαλλομένη ἡ ἀμαρτία. See also Theodoret's *Quaestiones in Exodum*, *Interrogatio* 38, PG LXXX, 264 C, where the nothingness of an idol is contrasted with the similitude of an image. This is probably taken over from Origen, *Homil. in Exodum* VIII, 3, GCS, *Origenes*, VI, 221 f. Cf. Theodore of Studion, *Antirrheticus* I, 16, PG XCIX, 345 C ff.

74. 509 D ff.

75. 285 A.

76. 132 D; 148.

77. 259.

78. Cf. R. Klibansky, "Ein Proklos-Fund und seine Bedeutung," *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 1928–1929/5 (1929).

79. *De divinis nominibus* IX, 6, PG III, 913 C f. From the same Platonic premises Cicero (*De natura deorum* I, 17, I, 24, II, 16 ff.) had reached a similar result and, therefore, had criticized Epicurus' euhemerist conception of the gods. This analogy was noticed by Petavius, *Dogmata Theologica* III (Paris, Vivès, 1865) 197.

80. *Antirrheticus* II, 10, PG XCIX, 357 B f.; *Epist.* II, 199, PG XCIX, 1604 D; etc.

81. *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* IV, 3, PG III, 473 C.

82. See, for instance, Theodore of Studion, *Antirrheticus* III, 2, 12, PG XCIX, 425 B f. Cf. my articles, "Der Bilderstreit und die Kunstlehren der byzantinischen und abendländischen Theologie," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Ser. III, I (1931) 1 ff., and "Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," *Mediaeval Studies* II (1940) 144; also the excellent study by P. Lucas Koch, unknown to me until recently: "Zur Theologie der Christusikone," *Benediktinische Monatsschrift* XIX (1937) 375 ff., XX (1938) 32 ff., 168 ff., 281 ff., 437 ff. (especially 44 and 282 f.).

83. Matthew 8:22, 9:9, 19:21; Luke 18:22; John 1:43, 21:19; etc.

84. 1 John 3:2.

85. *Theaetetus* 176 A f.

86. *Ennead* I, 6, 6.

87. Cf. *Stromata* II, 22 (132, 1 f., 136, 1), GCS, *Clemens Alex.*, II, 185 f., 188.

88. Cf. *Laws*, 716 C, 837 A; *Theaetetus* 176 A f.

89. See 1 Corinthians 11:1; Ephesians 5:1; etc.

90. *De principiis* III, 6, 1, GCS, *Origenes*, V, 280; *In Genes, homil.* I, 13, *ibid.* VI, 18.
91. *De professione christiana*, PG XLVI, 244 f.
92. Cf. also L. Delatte, *Les Traités de la royauté d'Ecphante, Diotogène et Sthénidas* (*Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège* XCVII, Liège-Paris, 1942), especially 178 f.
93. *Stromata* V, 5 (29, 1), GCS, *Clemens Alex.*, II, 344. For Eurytus-Eurysus, cf. E. Wellmann, in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Neue Bearbeitung*, VI (Stuttgart, 1909) 1363; H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* I (Berlin, 1951) 419; for the genuine Eurytus, H. Cherniss, *Aristotle's Criticism of Presocratic Philosophy* (Baltimore, 1935) 37, n. 139; 239. On the relationship between Eurysus, Clement, and the Neo-Pythagorean Ecphantus, cf. Delatte, *op. cit.*, 177 ff., and see note 158 below.
94. *De vita pythagorica* 18, 86 f., and 28, 137, ed. L. Deubner (Leipzig, 1937) 50 f., 77. For Jamblichus' source, cf. E. Rohde, "Die Quellen des Jamblichus in seiner Biographie des Pythagoras," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Neue Folge*, XXVII (1872) 45 f.
95. *Pro imaginibus* 28.
96. In the following century, Diogenes Laertius (VIII, 1, 19, VI, 2, 5) was to attribute a similar doctrine to Diogenes of Sinope.
97. See *Ambiguorum Liber*, PG XCI, 1084 A. Cf. H. U. v. Balthasar, S.J., *Liturgie cosmique: Maxime le Confesseur* (Paris, 1947) 87.
98. Cf. J. M. Mercati, "Stephani Bostreni nova de sacris imaginibus fragmenta e libro deperdito κατὰ Ἰουδαίων," *Theologische Quartalschrift* LXXVII (1895) 663 ff.
99. Cf. Sirarpie Der Nersessian, "Une Apologie des images du 7<sup>ième</sup> siècle," *Byzantion* XVII (1944-45) 58 ff.; Norman H. Baynes, "The Icons before Iconoclasm," *Harvard Theological Review* XLIV (1951) 93 ff.; Paul J. Alexander, "Hypatius of Ephesus: A Note on Image Worship in the Sixth Century," *ibid.* XLV (1952) 177 ff.
100. Cf. Mansi, *Concil.* XIII, 160 D ff. There also survives a fragment of a *Sermon on the Images* by Symeon (PG LXXXVI, 3219 f.; cf. O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* V [Freiburg i.B., 1932] 71 f.), quoted by John Damascene, *De imaginibus, oratio* III (PG XCIV, 1409 C f.).
101. Cf. Miss Der Nersessian's article quoted above; also J.-B. Frey, "La Question des images chez les Juifs," *Biblica* XV (1934), 298 ff.
102. Cf. S. Der Nersessian, *op. cit.*, 79 ff.; F. Vernet, in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* VIII/2 (Paris, 1925) 1876 ff., s.v. *Juifs* (*Controverses avec les*); also *Les Trophées de Damas: Controverse judéo-chrétienne du 7<sup>ième</sup> siècle*, ed. G. Bardy, *Patrologia Orientalis* XV (1927).
103. PG XCIV, 1376 B ff.
104. Edited in the article quoted in note 98.
105. Cf. Mansi, *Concil.* XII, 1069 A.
106. Mercati, *op. cit.*, 666, 668. The nature of the pagan idol could also be characterized by its unreality, its being based on fiction; for orthodox Byzantine argumentation on these lines, see P. Lucas Koch, "Zur Theologie der Christuskone," *Benediktin. Monatsschrift* XX (1938) 33, n. 1.
107. Cf. J. Geffcken, "Der Bilderstreit des heidnischen Altertums," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* XIX (1916-1919) 286 ff.; A. Grabar, *Martyrium* II (Paris, 1946) 350.
108. It is touched upon only in passing by E. Cassirer, "Eidos und Eidolon," *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg* 1922/23, I (1924) 1 ff., and H. Willms, *EIKON* (Münster, 1935) 15 ff.
109. This appears as a pagan point of view in Augustine's *Enarratio in Psalm. CXIII, Sermo II*, 4 f., Migne, *Patrologia Latina* (hereafter *PL*) XXXVII, 1483 f., and in the late seventh-century fictitious dialogue between a "Greek" and a Christian by John of Salonika, quoted in the *Acts of the Second Nicaenum*, Mansi, *Concil.* XIII, 164 C ff.
110. *Ennead* IV, 3, 11. Cf. A. Grabar, "Plotin et les origines de l'esthétique médiévale," *Cahiers archéologiques* I (1945) 17.
111. See J. Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre . . . avec les fragments des traités Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων et De regressu animae* (Gand and Leipzig, 1913), fragment 2, p. 2.\* Cf. Geffcken, *op. cit.*,



307, for possible dependence on Poseidonius. See, furthermore, E. Bevan, *Holy Images* (London, 1940) 74 ff., 108 f.

112. Philostratus Major, *Imagines* I, Prooem 1, ed. O. Benndorf, C. Schenkl, etc. (Leipzig, 1843) 3: "Ὅστις μὴ ἀσπάζεται τὴν ζωγραφίαν, ἀδικεῖ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, etc. (Cf. Borinski, *op. cit.*, I, 1; Panofsky, *op. cit.*, 6). See also his life of Apollonius of Tyana, II, 22: . . . ἔστι τι γραφικὴ; εἴ γε . . . καὶ ἀληθεία.

113. *Ekphrasis* 10, 2, ed. C. Schenkl and E. Reisch (Leipzig, 1902) 64: the image seen seems to be not a τύπος . . . ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀληθείας πλάσμα . . . ἡ τέχνη . . . ἐνεικονισαμένη τὸν θεὸν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐξίσταται. ὕλη μὲν οὐσα θεοειδὲς ἀναπέμπει νόημα . . .

114. *Fragmentum epistolae*, ed. J. Bidez and F. Cumont, *Imp. Caesaris Flavii Claudii Iuliani Epistolae, Leges* . . . (Paris, London, 1922) no. 89 b (293 f.) pp. 133 f.

115. Cf. Leontius of Neapolis in Cyprus, cited in the *Acts of the Second Nicaenum*, Mansi, *Concil.* XIII, 44.

116. Nicephorus, *Antirrheticus III adversus Constantinum Copronymum* 10, PG C, 392 B-C.

117. *De imaginibus, oratio III*, 20, PG XCIV, 1340 C f.; see above.

118. Theodore of Studion, *Antirrheticus III*, 2, 5, PG XCIX, 420 A.

119. Page 13.

120. Cf. my two articles quoted in note 82; the relevant texts from John Damascene and Theodore of Studion are cited in them.

121. Theodore of Studion, *Antirrheticus III*, 3, 1, PG XCIX, 420 D; also *op. cit.* 3, 9, *ibid.* 424 D; furthermore, *Epist.* . . . *ad Platonem de cultu sacrarum imaginum*, *ibid.* 501 A f., 504 A.

122. Cf., for instance, Theodore of Studion, *Antirrheticus I*, 12, PG XCIX, 344 B: Οὕτω καὶ ἐν εἰκόνι εἶναι τὴν θεότητα εἰπὼν τις οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτη τοῦ δέοντος.

123. Mansi, *Concil.* XIII, 244 B.

124. *Antirrheticus III*, 2, 11, PG XCIX, 426 A f. (where it is used for an iconoclast's objection); cf. also *Epist.* . . . *ad Platonem de cultu sacrarum imaginum*, *ibid.* 501 B ff. See, furthermore, Nicephorus *Antirrheticus III versus Constantinum Copronymum* 21, PG C, 405 D-408, referring to St. Basil. The iconoclasts apparently used the *physis-thesis* antithesis for the distinction of the historical and the eucharistic Body of Christ; cf. P. Lucas Koch, "Zur Theologie der Christusikone," *Benediktin. Monatsschrift* XX (1938) 40.

125. Cf. K. Hansmann, *Ein neuentdeckter Kommentar zum Johannesevangelium* (*Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte* XVI/4-5, Paderborn, 1930) 42 ff., 46 ff. See also Grumel, in *Dict. de théol. cath.* VII/1, 792, for Euthymus Zigabenus.

126. *De imaginibus, oratio III*, 18, PG XCIV, 1337 C. Cf. Hansmann, *op. cit.*, 42 f.

127. *De imaginibus, oratio III*, *loc. cit.* 1337 D-1340 B. Cf. also John Damascene's poem on the Transfiguration of Christ, PG XCVI, 848 ff., esp. 849B: Θέσει οὐ γέγονας, etc.

128. PG XCIV, 641 A.

129. Cf. *Categories* 4, 2a.

130. PG XCIV, 641 A f.

131. *Physics* 193 a.

132. *Ibid.* 199 a.

133. *De Haeresibus* 83, PG XCIV, 744 C ff.

134. Philoponi in *Physicorum octo libros commentaria* (*Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca*, ed. Academia Litterarum Regia Borussica, XVI-XVII, Berlin, 1888).

135. *Op. cit.* 213 (to Aristotle, *Physics*, 193a 14): τὴν θέσει καὶ μὴ φύσει διάθεσιν. It is true that elsewhere in his *Physics*, Aristotle uses the term *thesis* (e.g., 205 b 34), and even *thesis* and *physis* combined (208 b 24 ff.).

136. *Op. cit.* 454 (to Aristotle, *Physics* 205 b 24; cf. *Physics* 205 b 34, 208 b 24).

137. See Plato, *Cratylus* 389 D f., 390 D ff., 430 ff.; *Epist.* 7, 342 f.; cf. Steckerl, *op. cit.*, *Class. Philol.* XXXVII (1942) 288 ff. See also Proclus, *In rem publicam*, ed. W. Kroll, I (Leipzig, 1901) 169 f.; *id.*, *In Cratylum*, c. XLVIII, ed. G. Pasquali (Leipzig, 1908) 16, and, especially, c. XVI, *loc. cit.* 5 f., where the *thesis-physis* antithesis is derived from a divergence of opinion concerning the origin of names between Pythagoras and Democritus (see H. Diels,

*Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*° II [Berlin, 1922] 68, 55 B 26). For the relationship, established, it seems, by the Stoics, and elaborated on by Philo, between the antithesis *thesis-physis* and that of *nomos* and *physis*, cf. F. Heinimann, *Nomos und Physis* (Basel, 1945) 162 f., and M. Radin's incidental remarks in his article "Early Statutory Interpretation in England," *Illinois Law Review of North Western University* XXXVIII (1944) 25 f. See above all Stephan Kuttner, "Sur les origines du terme 'droit positif,'" *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, Serie IV, Année XV (1936) 728 ff., where the antithesis *ius positivum* — *ius naturale* is traced on the one hand to the pre-Socratic-Platonistic tradition, mentioned above, via Proclus' *Cratylus Commentary* and via Chalcidius and Aulus Gellius, and, on the other hand, to a passage concerning the *locus naturalis aut positivus* from Fortunatianus' *Ars Rhetorica* (*Rhetores latini minores* [ed. Halm, Leipzig, 1863] II, 3), which in my opinion must ultimately depend on the Aristotelian tradition here discussed (Münscher, in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* VII [Stuttgart, 1912] 48, speaks only of a Greek source in general). Carl Langer, "Euhemeros und die Theorie der φύσει und θέσει θεοί," *Angelos* II (1926) 53 ff., was not available to me; see the article of E. Kantorowicz quoted in the following note.

138. See above, p. 3 f. Philo could also be quoted, but hardly influenced John Damascene's antithetical use of the terms *physis* and *thesis* as relating to images, though he quotes Philo repeatedly in the *Sacra Parallela*. While this paper was at the press, there appeared the stimulating article by Ernst H. Kantorowicz, "Deus per Naturam, Deus per Gratiam: A Note on Mediaeval Political Theology," *Harvard Theological Review* XLV (1952) 253 ff., which touches on several points discussed here; see, especially, pp. 261 ff., for the *physis-charis* antithesis and its relation to the *physis-thesis* and the *physis-mimesis* antitheses. For the relationship between grace, image, and truth, cf. also below, p. 19.

139. Eustathius of Antioch quoted by Theodoret of Cyrus, *Dialogus* II (*Inconfusus*), PG LXXXIII, 176 C.

140. *Oratio* XXX (*Theologica IV: De Filio*) 20, PG XXXVI, 129 B f.

141. The Platonistic element is obviously strong in all these speculations. The same line of thought is still evident in St. Augustine when he defines a true image by the fact that it is generated or made by that which it resembles, as a son by his father or the reflection in a mirror by that which is reflected in it (cf. *Quaestion. in Heptateuchum* V, 4, PL XXXIV, 749 f.; *De diversis quaestionibus, quaestio* 51, *ibid.* XL, 32 f.). While from this point of view there is no great difficulty in seeing the image of God in man, it is different with the images of art, since they are not, at first sight at least, generated or made by their prototypes. But already Plotinus had answered this objection by stressing the mere instrumentality of the artist without forgetting the nevertheless merely "thetical" character of the image of art (cf. especially *Ennead* VI, 4, 9 f.).

142. *De imaginibus, oratio* III, PG XCIV, 1368 D.

143. I, 2, 6, GCS, *Origenes*, V, 34. Here it is quite clear that the most "natural" image is that of God Father in Christ, and that the relationship of a son and a father is considered less "natural" than that between *the* Son and *the* Father, but more natural than that between an art image and its prototype. This hierarchical order of images is still found in the iconoclastic period; cf. the ninth-century *Commentary to the Gospel of St. John*, edited by Hansmann (quoted in note 125), pp. 48 f.

144. See Mansi, *Concil.* IX, 384 C. Cf. also *ibid.* 210 B ff. (*Collatio* IV, c. XVII). Furthermore, Johannes Philoponus, *De opificio mundi* VI, 9 f., especially 10 (end), ed. W. Reichardt (Leipzig, 1897) 244 f.: in his Monophysite polemic against Theodore of Mopsuestia, Philoponus compares the latter's conception of Christ's relation to the Father to the pagan conception of the relation between their idols and their gods; see also Philoponus against Iamblichus, in Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Cod. 215, PG CIII, 708 B ff.

145. *Ibid.* IV, 12. Cf. R. Devreesse, *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste* (*Studi e Testi* CXLI, Città del Vaticano, 1948) 246 ff., for the doubtful authenticity of the Theodorian texts used by the Council.

146. The antithesis *adoption-birth* is one of the legal applications of the *thesis-physis* antithesis; cf. Heinimann, *op. cit.*, 163.

147. *De imaginibus, oratio* III, PG XCIV, 1412 C f.

148. *In Exod. homil.* VI, 5, GCS, *Origenes*, VI, 196 f. Similarly, Augustine, *Quaestion. in Heptateuch.* V, 4, *loc. cit.*

149. *In Epist. ad Hebraeos* [10, 1], *homil. XVII*, PG LXIII, 130: . . . τουτέστιν οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Ἔως μὲν γὰρ ἂν ὡς ἐν γραφῇ περιάγη τις τὰ χαράγματα [this must be the correct reading even though Migne (after Montfaucon) has χρώματα in the text and gives χαράγματα only as a variant; χαράγματα is confirmed by the text from Cyril of Alexandria quoted below, and by the *Acts of the Quinisextum*, cited in note 153] σκιὰ τίς ἐστιν ὅταν δὲ τὸ ἄνθος ἐπαλείψῃ τις καὶ ἐπιχρίσῃ τὰ χρώματα, τότε εἰκὼν γίνεται. Τοιοῦτόν τι καὶ ὁ νόμος ἦν. <<Σκιὰν γὰρ>> φήσιν, <<ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων>> (Hebrews 10:1), τουτέστι τῆς θυσίας τῆς ἀφέσεως. See also *In Epist. ad Hebr.* [7, 1 ff.], *homil. XII*, *ibid.* 98: Οὕτω καὶ ἐν ταῖς σκιαγραφουμέναις εἰκόσι γινόμεν ἴδοι τις ἂν ἐν ἐκείναις γὰρ ἔστι μὲν τι καὶ ὅμοιον, ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἀνόμοιον· διὰ μὲν γὰρ τῆς ἀπλῶς γραφῆς ὁμοιότης τίς ἐστι τοῦ χαρακτῆρος· τῶν χρωμάτων δὲ ἐπιτεθέντων τότε φανερώς δέκνυνται ἡ διαφορὰ, καὶ τὸ ὅμοιον καὶ τὸ ἀνόμοιον. Furthermore *In prodicionem Iudae*, *homil.* I, 4 (end), *ibid.* XLIX, 379 (quoted by John Damascene, *De imaginibus, oratio II*, PG XCIV, 1316 A): Καθάπερ γὰρ οἱ ζωγράφοι ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ πίνακι καὶ τὰς γραμμὰς περιάγουσι καὶ τὴν σκινὴν γράφουσι (John Damascene: σκιαγραφοῦσι) καὶ τότε τὴν ἀλήθειαν τῶν χρωμάτων αὐτῷ ἐπιτιθέασιν, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐποίησεν, when at one and the same table He celebrated the Pascha of the Jews, which was only τυπικόν, and the true one of the New Testament. Cf. also Cyril of Alexandria, *Epist.* 41 (to Bishop Acacius of Melitene), PG LXXVII, 217 B f.: Φαμέν δὲ ὅτι σκιὰ καὶ τύπος ὁ νόμος ἦν καὶ οἷόν τις γραφῇ παρατεθεῖσα πρὸς θεὸν τοῖς ὁρώσι τὰ πράγματα. Αἱ δὲ σκιά τῆς τῶν γραφόντων ἐν πίναξιν τέχνης τὰ πρῶτα τῶν χαραγμάτων εἰσὶν αἷς εἴπερ ἐπενεχθεῖεν τῶν χρωμάτων τὰ ἄνθη, τότε δὴ τότε τῆς γραφῆς ἀπασπράπτει τὸ κάλλος; this text was quoted by the *Acts of the Second Nicaenum* (Mansi, *Concil.* XIII, 11 B, where the addressee is called Acacius of Scythopolis). Cyril's somewhat younger contemporary, Diadochus of Photicaea, *De perfectione spirituali (Centum Capita)* 89, ed. and trans. E. des Places, S.J. (Paris, Lyon, 1943) 151, used the simile of underpainting and finished picture in a somewhat different way: the former is the image of God in man which is his from creation and is restored in baptism, the second the resemblance with God which must be gained by a virtuous life; for this distinction, see p. 11 above. Concerning *skiagraphia* and related terms, it should be noted — and here I owe valuable suggestions to Professor Erwin Panofsky — that in antiquity they did at first not signify an "underpainting" but the painting of shadows which was the invention of Apollodorus of Athens (late fifth century). The texts, from Plato to Photius, are discussed most thoroughly by E. Pfuhl, "Apollodorus ὁ σκιαγράφος," *Jahrbuch des kaiserl. deutschen archäologischen Instituts* XXV, 1910 (1911) 12 ff., R. Schöne, "Σκιαγραφία," *ibid.* XXVII, 1912 (1912) 19 ff., Pfuhl, "Skiagraphia," *ibid.* 227 ff.; *id.*, *Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen II* (München, 1923) 674 ff.; P.-M. Schuhl, *Platon et l'art de son temps* (Paris, 1933) 10 ff.; for the relationship between *skiagraphia* and *scenographia*, see also E. Panofsky, "Die Perspektive als symbolische Form," *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg 1924-1925* (1927) 301 ff. Probably it was in Hellenistic times that the term *skiagraphia* first could assume the meaning of a sketch or an underpainting; Vitruvius, *De architectura* I, 2, 2 (Rose; I, 2, 8 Choisy) uses the equivalent *adumbratio* in this sense; see also the late second century *Acta Joannis* 27, edd. Lipsius and Bonnet 165. See, furthermore, Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* XXXV, 3 (5) [15], 12 (43) [151], where the art of painting and molding figures is derived from the tracing of the outline of a man's shadow, and similarly Athenagoras, *Legatio pro christianis* 17, PG VI, 924 A, where the word σκιαγραφία is used in this connection; see also Philostratus Major, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, II, 22. The terminologies of Chrysostom, Cyril, and the Damascene are clearly related to those of Athenagoras and Philostratus.

150. I was unable to find a printed text of John Chrysostom which would exactly correspond to that of John Damascene; the latter's paraphrase may be his own or originate from a different manuscript tradition of John Chrysostom's commentary or from a catena; cf. R. Devreesse, in *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément*, I (Paris, 1928) 1211 ff., *s.v.* *Chaines exégétiques grecques*. John Damascene's own anthology from John Chrysostom's commentaries to St. Paul does not contain any similar text commenting on Hebrews (cf. PG XCV, 439 ff.).

151. The term εἰκών is here the equivalent of τύπος in the sense of anticipation; see the following note.

152. *De imaginibus, oratio III*, PG XCIV, 1361 D f. (also *oratio I*, *ibid.* 1269 D f., *oratio II*, *ibid.* 1312 D): Καί πως εἰκὼν τοῦ δευτέρου τὸ πρῶτον, ὁ Μελχισεδέκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς περ ἂν τις εἴποι σκιὰν τῆς γραφῆς τῆς ἐν χρωμάτι τὸ πρὸ ταύτης σκίασμα τοῦ γράφειν. Διὰ τοῦτον γὰρ ὁ νόμος καλεῖται σκιά ἡ δὲ χάρις ἀλήθεια, πράγματα δὲ τὰ μέλλοντα. Ὡστε ὁ μὲν νόμος καὶ ὁ Μελχισεδέκ: προσκίασμα τῆς ἐν χρώμασι γραφῆς; ἡ δὲ χάρις, ἡ ἀλήθεια: ἡ ἐν χρώμασι γραφή; τὰ πράγματα τὰ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. Ὡς εἶναι τὴν Παλαιὰν τύπου τύπον, καὶ τὴν Νέαν τῶν πραγμάτων τύπον. For the concept of the image as truth, cf. note 112, quoting Philostratus. The texts of John Chrysostom and John Damascene here discussed are cited by H. Lubac, S.J., *Corpus Mysticum* (Paris, 1949) 219, n. 55; see also his important remarks and texts concerning *veritas, imago, figura*, etc., *ibid.* 210 ff., 248 ff. Cf., for instance, the following text from St. Ambrose which differs significantly from John Damascene and even from John Chrysostom: *Umbra in Lege, imago vero in Evangelio, veritas in caelestibus* (*In Psalm. XXXVIII Enarratio*, c. 25, PL XIV, 1051 C; Lubac, *op. cit.*, 219; cf. also Dürig, *Imago* 31). One might note here briefly the relationship of such conceptions to early Christian and mediaeval "typology" in theology, literature and art and also a remote connection with later Joachimite ideas on the "Third Age" of the Holy Spirit — influenced undoubtedly by Greek thought. For the development of the concept of "figure" (τύπος, *figura*) above all in the Latin west, but with some remarks also about the corresponding Greek terms such as τύπος, μορφή, εἶδος, σχῆμα, see E. Auerbach, *Figura*, in *Neue Dantestudien* (*Istanbuler Schriften* V, Istanbul, 1944). A detailed investigation of the relevant Greek patristic terms (especially *χαρακτήρ*) in their relation to the image concept would be rewarding.

153. Cf. Mansi, *Concil.* XI, 977 E–980 A: Ἐν τισι τῶν σεπτῶν εἰκόνων γραφαῖς ἁμνὸς δακτύλῳ τοῦ προδρόμου δεικνύμενος ἐγχαράττεται . . . Τοὺς οὖν παλαίους τύπους καὶ τὰς σκιάς ὡς τῆς ἀληθείας συμβολάτε καὶ προχαράγματα παραδεδομένους τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ κατασπαζόμενοι τὴν χάριν προσιμῶμεν καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὡς πλήρωμα νόμου ταύτην ὑποδεξάμενοι. Ὡς ἂν οὖν τὸ τέλειον κἂν ταῖς χρωματοργίαις ἐν ταῖς ἀπάντων ὄψεσιν ὑπογράφηται τὸν τοῦ αἵροντος τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου ἁμνοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸν ἀνθρώπινον χαρακτήρα καὶ ἐν ταῖς εἰκόσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀντὶ τοῦ παλαιοῦ ἁμνοῦ ἀναστηλοῦσθαι ὀρίζομεν. . . This text was repeatedly quoted by the iconophiles; cf., for instance, the *Acts of the Second Nicaenum*, Mansi, *op. cit.* XII, 1123 E ff., XIII, 40 E f.

154. E. v. Dobschütz, *Christusbilder (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, XVIII, Neue Folge III, 1899), especially 276 ff.

155. A. Grabar, *Martyrium* II (Paris, 1946) 351 ff.

156. A striking example of this practice, knowledge of which I owe to Professor Albert M. Friend, Jr., may be found in the *Acts of the Eighth Ecumenical Council*, held at Constantinople in 869 (Mansi, *Concil.* XVI, 388 C–D). There, one of the stragglers of the defeated iconoclastic movement was confronted with an imperial coin of Basil I which may well have shown the image of Christ in addition to that of the emperor (see below, note 168), and the iconoclast was admonished in vain to render to the "theandric" image of Our Lord the same honor which he was willing to accord to that of the terrestrial Basileus.

157. Edited by L. Delatte, *Les Traités de la royauté d'Ecphante, Diotogène et Sténéidas* (Liège-Paris, 1942). Cf. also E. R. Goodenough, "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship," *Yale Classical Studies* I (New Haven, 1928) 53 ff. Delatte rather convincingly argues for the first or second century of our era as the date of these treatises; Goodenough thinks that they date from the Hellenistic period itself, which they certainly reflect in many ways.

158. See, especially, Ecphantus, ed. L. Delatte, *loc. cit.*, 27 f. (272, 9–273, 2), and Delatte's commentary, 177 ff., where it is made probable that Ecphantus has here utilized and transferred from man in general to the king the text from Eurysus, quoted by Clement of Alexandria and referred to above p. 14.

159. See, for instance, the famous inscription for Ptolemy V Epiphanes on the Rosetta Stone where the king is called εἰκὼν ζῶσα τοῦ Διὸς; for the cross-connections between this Hellenistic kingship ideology and certain terms of the Old and New Testaments, cf. W.

Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (Göttingen, 1921) 150 ff., 200 ff., 244 ff. For the related concept of the king as animate law, cf. A. Steinwenter, "NOMOS ΕΜΨΥΧΟΣ," *Anzeiger der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, LXXXIII, 1946 (1947) 250 ff.

160. For instance, *De vita Constantini* I, 5, GCS, *Eusebius* I, 9; *Tricennial Oration* I (end), II, *ibid.*, 199 f. Cf. N. H. Baynes, "Eusebius and the Christian Empire," *Mélanges Bidez* (*Annales de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientale*, II, Bruxelles, 1934) 13 ff.; also K. M. Setton, *Christian Attitude towards the Emperor* . . . (quoted in note 8) 47 ff.

161. See *De regno* IX (9c), rec. N. Terzaghi, *Synesii Cyrenensis Hymni et Opuscula* II/1 (Roma, 1944) 20, where the Emperor Arcadius is called a moving and animate divine image (ἄγαλμα . . . κινούμενον . . . καὶ ἔμπνοον); there is contamination here with the νόμος ἔμψυχος idea, cf. note 158. Cf. Setton, *op. cit.*, 152 ff.

162. For Themistius, see the ample references in L. Delatte, *Les Traités de la royauté* . . . 156 ff.

163. See above p. 10 ff. It must be remembered, however, that in the combined Biblical and Platonistic tradition these two relationships were often merged: on the one hand, perfect man as such is a king (according to the Platonic concept of the kingly philosopher as well as according to the Biblical ideas of Adam's royal character and of the Kingdom of God in every true Christian); on the other, the ruler represents God in a special and leading manner. Thus, for Clement of Alexandria (cf. especially *Stromata* I, 24, GCS, *Clemens Alex.*, II, 99 ff. [158, 1 ff.]) as for Philo before him (cf. *De vita Mosis* II, 1 ff., ed. Cohn and Wendland, *loc. cit.* IV, 200 ff.), Moses was the true paragon of royal philosophy, of the wise man who is a king and of the king who is a wise man. Clement thought it certain, furthermore, that Plato's concept of the king-philosopher had its origin in the Old Testament (see, for instance, *Stromata* I, 25, *loc. cit.* 103 [165, 1], II, 5, *ibid.* 123 ff. [20, 1 ff.]). In Clement, the interest for the royal dignity of man is much stronger than that for rulership in the political sense; the topoi of the *animate image* (ἄγαλμα ἔμψυχος, cf. *Protrepticus* 10, GCS, *Clemens Alex.*, I, 71 [98, 3]), and the *animate law* (νόμος ἔμψυχος, cf. *Stromata* I, 26, II, 4, *ibid.* II, 104 [168, 1], 122 [18, 4 ff.]) are here applied in a genuine Biblical and Platonic sense to man and to Moses, respectively, rather than in the Hellenistic way to the ruler. See, similarly, Gregory of Nyssa, *De opificio hominis*, 4, PG XLIV, 136 C, on man as the ἔμψυχος εἰκὼν (quoted by John Damascene, *De imaginibus, oratio* I, PG XCIV, 1268 D f.); cf. Setton, *op. cit.*, 201. It is likely, however, that Clement knew the ideology of the Hellenistic monarchy; he uses the typical Hellenistic term of royal beneficence for his true gnostic (see *Stromata* II, 19, *loc. cit.* II, 166 [97, 1 f.]): εὐεργετῶν καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ; (cf. for instance, the attribute Εὐεργετής of Ptolemy III). See now the study of Ernst H. Kantorowicz, quoted in note 138, for a fuller discussion of the relationship between the concepts of man in general, and of the ruler in particular, as image of God; also F. E. Cranz, "Kingdom and Polity in Eusebius of Caesarea," *Harvard Theological Review* XLV (1952) 47 ff., especially 51-56.

164. Matthew 22:21.

165. Cf. *In Lucam homil.* XXXIX, GCS, *Origenes*, IX, 230: "Quod ergo ait: 'reddite quae sunt Caesaris, Caesari,' hoc dicit: deponite personam 'choici,' abjicite imaginem terrenam, ut possitis vobis personam caelestis imponentes reddere 'quae sunt Dei, Deo.'" Cf. also *In Matthaeum*, Tom. XVII, 27, *ibid.* X, 658 ff.

166. Cf. 1 Corinthians 15:49: "Therefore, as we have borne the image of the earthly, let us bear also the image of the heavenly." The first part of this verse refers to Genesis 2:7: "And the Lord God formed man of the slime of the earth . . ."; the second sentence of Genesis 2:7 is quoted by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians 15:45: "The first man Adam was made into a living soul"; and the Apostle continues, "the last Adam into a quickening spirit." The last Adam, the heavenly, is Christ. See above, note 27.

167. That is the man who lives according to Christ, i.e., who strips himself of "the old man with his deeds" and puts on "the new, him who is renewed unto knowledge according to the image of Him that created him" (Colossians 3:9 f.; Genesis 1:26). Although Origen does not here quote Colossians 3:9 f. or Genesis 1:26, his references to the image of Christ

in man (1 Corinthians 15:49) as well as to man's earthly part (Genesis 2:7) imply those two other verses, that is to say, the creational spiritual image of God in man, according to Genesis 1:26, and its renewal or reform according to the doctrine of St. Paul, also expressed in Romans 12:2, 2 Corinthians 3:18, etc. For Origen's interpretation of Genesis 1:26, see above, p. 12.

168. See W. Wroth, *Catalogue of the Imperial Byzantine Coins in the British Museum*, I (London, 1908) xcii, xciv. For the iconoclast emperors' substitution of their own image for the image of Christ, cf. A. Grabar, *L'Empereur dans l'art byzantin* (*Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg*, Fasc. LXXV, Paris, 1936) 167 ff.; P. Lucas Koch, "Christusbild-Kaiserbild," *Benediktinische Monatsschrift* XXI (1939) 85 ff.; also the second of my articles quoted in note 82.